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Despite significant progress toward a market economy since the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine’s transition to a functioning democracy remains slow, partly because of widespread corruption. The topic of university-based education for moral character and engaged citizenship is worthy of exploration because of its potential to affect the future of the country’s democracy. This qualitative single-case study was informed by theories of moral and character education. It explored Ukrainian Catholic University leaders’ beliefs about university-based student moral and civic formation and the ways their beliefs informed the university’s organizational mission and practices. Data were obtained via artifacts, documents, and in-depth individual interviews with UCU leaders, students, and members of the Ukrainian academic community. The study is situated within Ukraine’s post-Soviet period from 1991 to early 2011. Study findings indicate that Christian anthropology and Catholic Social Teaching are a foundation of UCU leaders’ philosophy.
UCU’s mission and practices reflect the university leaders’ values and the university’s stand for dignity and against corruption, as well as its goal of educating a new generation of Ukrainian leaders. The moral climate in UCU supports students’ moral development and civic formation. UCU leaders strive to intentionally create an integrated learning process by incorporating issues of ethics and values into the undergraduate curriculum and co-curricular activities and by preparing students for a life of commitment to justice, service, and civic engagement. The findings are pertinent to Ukraine’s higher education reforms and to Western international development policy toward Ukraine in the area of promoting democratic development in the post-Soviet space through higher education.
Chapter One

As I write, it is December 15, 2013, a historic day for Ukraine. The people of Ukraine have declared today the Day of Dignity. Over 200,000 people have gathered for a people’s assembly, a *viche*, in Kyiv’s Independence Square, the Maidan (Kruk, 2014). Throughout history, the people of Ukraine and the Kyivan Rus have called such gatherings in times of great national importance (*Viche*, n.d.). For the last three weeks, the people of Ukraine have filled the streets and squares in Ukraine’s cities and towns. Responding to the brutal violence of authorities against peaceful demonstrators on November 30 and December 11, the protests have called the nation to rise up for its dignity and not allow its future to be determined by the criminal groups and oligarchs that have ruled the country for the past decade. A poem by a street poet in Kyiv states the essence of the protests (Figure 1):
We are the peaceful people!
We do not want a war!
We just want to live!
As people live there,
Where their sons are happy,
Where the people are not ruled by bandits!
(English translation).

Unlike the Orange Revolution of 2004, the December Dignity Revolution was not begun by opposition politicians. Ukraine’s Dignity Revolution of 2013–2014 was a direct
response to President Yanukovych’s actions when he suddenly revoked Ukraine’s decision toward accession to the European Union (EU), with its perceived democratic values such as fairness and justice, and opted for closer ties with Russia. This decision, in the minds of many, set a course for continued widespread corruption and injustice in Ukraine and sparked the Revolution of Dignity, for there is a strong belief (based on wide experience) that corruption that militates against human dignity dominates Ukraine (Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity, 2014). Young college and university students in the city of Lviv organized the first protests in the late fall of 2013 and called on residents of the national capital, Kyiv, to rise up also. Following the call, the students and university rectors of Kyiv universities called Kyivans to the Maidan, and students, young entrepreneurs, and employees have since flooded the streets and squares of Kyiv and other cities. They have been singing the Ukrainian national anthem, wrapped in national flags of Ukraine, decorated by ribbons or dressed in clothing of the flag’s colors, blue and yellow. They have been joined by people of all generations, including politicians, musicians, athletes, and business people. They have been singing, dancing, praying, performing various styles of music, and reading poetry that calls for a new beginning, to establish a new Ukraine that would embrace as its main principle the value of human dignity.

Now, more than a year later, it is clear that Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity indicated strong support for democratic values among Ukraine’s younger generations. In addition, media coverage of the events of the revolution made clear the key role of university students and the desire of young Ukrainians for a noncorrupt Ukraine.
Background of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to explore Ukrainian university leaders’ views on the moral and civic formation of undergraduate students. This chapter provides an overview of the context of Ukraine’s higher education between 1991—the start of the country’s independence—and 2011. This chapter also covers the challenges of rising corruption in Ukrainian higher education and issues surrounding Ukraine’s private liberal arts universities. The purposes of the study and research questions are presented, followed by a discussion of the importance and the scope of the study. The chapter concludes with a definition of terms and a discussion of the study’s limitations and delimitations.

Ukraine gained its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991 and declared a course toward market reforms and democracy. In its effort to transition to a market economy and democracy, post-Soviet Ukraine has made significant steps toward the marketization of its economy. However, progress in democratic reforms remains slow and corruption has become a systemic problem in Ukrainian society (Kholod, 2011; Osipian, 2007, 2008a, 2008b). According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2011), corruption in Ukraine continues to be one of the largest obstacles to democratic reforms. The 2007 Transparency International Corruption Perception Index placed Ukraine in 118th position in terms of corruption out of 180 states (Transparency International, 2007). One year later it had slid to 134th place (Transparency International, 2008). By 2012, Ukraine’s position dropped to 144th, shared with Cameroon, Bangladesh, Congo, Syria, and Central African Republic (Transparency
International, 2012). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have been a major arena for corrupt practices. Nonetheless, according to Mashtaler (2007) and Osipian (2007), these institutions have the capacity to facilitate the transformation of consciousness and provide education based on the values of democracy and social justice.

Education is a very contextual enterprise. In Ukraine, understanding the context involves examining the issues that the country faces in its process of post-Soviet transition. The next section of this chapter discusses some of the developments and challenges the Ukrainian higher education sector has experienced since the country’s independence in 1991.

**Historical background: Ukraine’s private Christian HEIs.** The first private Christian colleges were established in Ukraine (as in other countries of the former Soviet Union) only after the decline of communist rule in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union (Levy, 2005; Petenko & Glanzer, 2005). In Ukraine, changes followed the country’s independence (1991). The revised Law of Ukraine on Education allowed the enrollment of tuition-paying students in state universities (Zhiliaev, 2005), acceptance of nonstate forms of financing, and creation of private HEIs (Verhovna Rada Ukainy, 1991). In addition, increased social and religious freedom encouraged religious and linguistic groups to establish HEIs with goals of furthering their religious or cultural objectives (Stetar & Stocker, 1997).

In 1991, after declaring independence from the Soviet Union, the country adopted a new Law of Ukraine on Education. The law instituted the people’s right to establish nonstate HEIs. The law stipulated that higher education financing could come from
outside traditional state subsidies to HEIs and include contributions from local
government budgets, the budgets of government ministries other than the Ministry of
Education and Science, business entities, organizations, and private payments by
individuals (Reisz, 2003). Higher education has gained a large share of the Ukrainian
educational sector; however, private HEIs still attract fewer students compared to public
HEIs (Vlasceanu & Voicu, 2006).

The research literature contains various criteria for defining private higher
education. Levy (2005) argues that several factors should be incorporated when
distinguishing whether a university is a private or a public entity and should include
consideration of the university’s financial sources, matters of administrative control and
academic autonomy, and the institutional mission (Levy, 2005). Reisz’s analysis (2003),
in addition to Levy’s criteria, includes consideration of form of ownership. In the context
of Ukraine, private means nonstate control of institutional mission, finances, and, to a
certain extent, matters of institutional administration and of the university’s academic
autonomy. However, as Levy (2005) points out, there may not be consistency, and some
private universities may receive some form of public funding (mostly from municipal
governments and through barter arrangements with local authorities). For the purpose of
more clearly portraying private Christian liberal arts higher education in Ukraine, it is
important to present a definition of private university, as understood by the Ukrainian
education community that can be derived from the Ukrainian legislative framework.

During the time of this study, between 2011 and 2013, the legislative framework
governing Ukraine’s higher education remained weak. It was an object of frequent
changes and lacked execution of legislation (Fried, Glass, & Baumgartl, 2006) because of political instability, a vacuum of political will, and systemic corruption in the country as a whole.

The legislative framework has also been a mechanism that reinforced corruption within Ukraine’s higher education sector, particularly in the area of fees for the licensing of private HEIs. This licensing requires some background to explain. During the time of the research for this study, the Ukrainian HEI legislative framework relied on a form of ownership criteria (Levy, 2005) to distinguish between public and private universities. It automatically considered public all Ukrainian universities that had been a part of the state system since the Soviet era, while automatically deeming all other HEIs to be not only private but also for-profit, putting these schools in a much higher tax bracket.

This categorization resulted in the creation of unequal operating environments for public and private universities. Public universities receive government financing and have traditionally offered tuition-free, government-subsidized education. Since 1991, however, most of the public universities have established tuition-charging programs and income-generating services, just like private universities. (Thus, one corollary of this arrangement is that sources of financing cannot be viewed as determinative of whether a university is a public or a private entity.)

The legislative framework also ignores the fact that, while some private universities may have a purely for-profit model and rely primarily on tuition and fees as their source of income, others have a social mission at the core of their organizational identity and rely on a combination of financial sources. These financial sources range
from private donations to university foundations established in other countries, denominational support from local and foreign ecclesiastical communities, tuition fees, in-kind contribution of foreign volunteers, fee-based programs aimed at and organized through cross-border collaboration, and formalized partnerships with foreign HEIs. Nonetheless, many private institutions cannot afford these higher taxes and end up paying bribes to government officials in order to maintain their licenses. This is the challenging environment in which a private institution such as UCU must operate.

Ukraine’s higher education and challenges of the post-Soviet democratic transition. Higher education in Ukraine during the post-Soviet era, with very few exceptions, remained grounded in totalitarian thinking and authoritarian practice (Koshmanova & Ravchyna, 2007). The system of higher education inherited from the Soviet Union placed great emphasis on theoretical knowledge. According to Gorobets (2008), part of the problem is that Ukrainian higher education has remained predominantly theory-focused, as opposed to competency-focused. Even in applied fields such as economics and business studies that were in high demand in Ukraine’s labor market, students acquired in-depth theoretical knowledge that was often not accompanied by the development of practical skills (Gorobets, 2008). In addition, Ukrainian society has placed a high value on possession of a degree document, regardless of the depth and quality of actual knowledge and competencies a person may in fact display (Gorobets, 2008). High societal demand for a university degree has led to the development of diploma mills. Previous research (Johns, 2004; Osipian, 2008b; Stetar & Berezkina, 2002) suggests that this has become a widespread practice, where universities issue a
degree document to an individual who either superficially completed required course work (often with very little or no attendance) or simply paid a bribe to an educational administrator with a certain level of authority. Multiple accounts have been documented of the dollar amounts in bribes that such degrees may cost (Belyakov, Cremonini, Mfusi, & Rippner, 2009; Pasechnik, 2009), and corruption schemes have even involved a former vice minister of education and employees of Ukraine’s Ministry of Education and Science (MES).

In the HEI setting, corruption now takes several forms, even at the admissions level (Osipian, 2007, 2008a, 2008b). In admissions, corruption may involve nepotism, bribes, or payments to admissions committee members purported to be tutoring fees for preparing for entrance exams. Corruption in the academic process (Osipian, 2008a) may be manifested by payments for tutoring or mentoring sessions with a professor to ensure a higher grade and leniency on final exams or by a requirement to present proof that a student purchased textbooks written by the course’s professor. Chapman (2005) identified levels of corruption that correspond to different levels in the hierarchy of the educational system: the level of Ukraine’s MES, the region or district level, the school level, the classroom teacher level, and the level of international agencies. Corrupt practices vary by level and may take the form of favoritism in procurement (a prevalent practice when the legal framework has gaps regarding bidding on contracts), favoritism in personnel appointments, purchase of admissions and grades, private tutoring, and skimming from project grants (Chapman, 2005).
Statement of the Problem

In Ukrainian, the term vyhovannya means character education as well as moral and civic formation, and it implies a holistic approach. Vyhovannya has historically occupied a central place in Ukraine’s Soviet and post-Soviet pre-K-16 curricula (Appendix A). Within Ukraine’s national character education standards, vyhovannya has been an integral part of school- and university-based education. The education of young professionals for moral character, ethical behaviors, and civic responsibility is particularly important for developing and sustaining democracy in Ukraine. However, in the context of the systemic corruption in Ukraine’s higher education sector, this goal may appear unattainable. Nevertheless, earlier research (Stetar & Berezkina, 2002) indicates that Ukrainian private HEIs have led the way in establishing transparent institutional practices and academic processes. They show evidence of less corruption and are more likely to emphasize moral character and democratic values in at least some of their programs and processes (Stetar, Panych, & Chen, 2005).

Currently, a small number of Ukrainian liberal arts universities are established as corruption-free zones. According to Glanzer and Ream (2009), most of these universities are grounded in a Christian worldview and share a commitment to social justice and the democratic transformation of Ukrainian society. Through their academic programs and emphasis on institutional ethics and accountability to the broader society, these universities strive to build a truly democratic and corruption-free Ukraine and educate young people to possess moral character and a strong sense of civic responsibility (Glanzer & Ream, 2009).
There is insufficient research regarding the role that Ukrainian university leaders may play in these corruption-free liberal arts universities. However, previous research on U.S. and Ukrainian HEIs (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Maldonado, Lacey, & Thompson, 2007) indicates that educational leaders play a critical role in establishing an organizational culture and moral climate conducive to students’ moral and civic formation. At the same time, little is known about Ukrainian university leaders’ beliefs and views on the civic and moral formation of undergraduate students in the post-Soviet context.

**Purpose of the Study**

HEIs have the capacity to educate students as thoughtful and socially responsible citizens by recognizing the fundamental importance of moral and civic education and creating developmentally appropriate educational processes and environments (Colby et al., 2003). In the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet transition, the issue of moral character and civic responsibility in the nation’s new generation of professionals, who were educated by the nation’s higher education sector, is worthy of exploration because of the potential that students’ moral and civic formation has for the future of Ukrainian democracy. This study examined this issue through views of the leaders and students of one Ukrainian private university, Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, investigating how their views align with the University’s organizational mission and practices within the broader context of contemporary Ukraine and the country’s higher education policies.
Research Questions

This is an exploratory, instrumental single-case study of UCU. Its leaders’ views of university-based moral and civic formation were explored from three angles: (a) philosophical, (b) institutional, and (c) theoretical. First, UCU leaders’ philosophical beliefs were examined. Second, alignment of UCU leaders’ philosophical beliefs with the university’s practices was explored. Finally, these institutional practices were examined through the lens of the study’s theoretical framework.

The following research questions were addressed:

1. How do UCU leaders describe the values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university and how do these values and beliefs align with the university’s policies and practices?

2. How do UCU leaders understand UCU’s institutional role in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

3. How do UCU leaders view their leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation?

4. How do UCU leaders view UCU’s institutional role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduates and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

Importance of the Study

Previous research offers significant insights into the role of university leaders in developing and sustaining democracy, including in Ukraine (Colby et al., 2003;
Maldonado et al., 2007; Vynoslavska, McKinney, Moore, & Longenecker, 2005). At the same time, little is known about Ukrainian university leaders’ beliefs and views on the civic and moral formation of undergraduate students through university-facilitated moral and civic character formation in the post-Soviet context. The study findings may inform future large-scale studies of university-based civic and moral formation in Ukraine and other former Soviet countries. It may also provide an insight into the possible ways to structure the education of undergraduates. In addition, it may inform national and organizational policies, as well as provide insight into promising institutional practices that would ensure university education prepares graduates for their professional lives and for being active citizens of a democracy.

**Conceptual Framework**

Previous research findings indicate that the higher a person’s stage of moral reasoning and moral development, the more likely he or she is to actively participate in and facilitate a democratic process (Colby et al., 2003; Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b; Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989a, 1989b). An earlier study suggested that individuals who adhere to a code of ethical values are more likely to display ethical decision-making in their professional and business practices (Vynoslavska et al., 2005). This study also indicates that Ukrainian business professionals, compared to their U.S. counterparts, less frequently practice ethical decision-making. In addition, previous research suggested that ethical and morally grounded decision-making has dramatically decreased since Ukraine’s independence (Vynoslavska et al., 2005). Finally, a study of American leaders (Maldonado et al., 2007) indicates that it is possible to educate a moral and ethical person
in a university by intentionally structuring educational processes and programs around this goal. The aforementioned research by Colby et al. (2003), Kohlberg (1985a, 1985b), Maldonado et al. (2007), and Power et al. (1989a, 1989b) indicates the importance of schools, as institutions, in facilitating the civic and moral formation of students. In addition, research indicates university leaders play a key role in promoting moral and democratic formation of undergraduate students (Colby et al., 2003).

In addition, the relationship between education for democracy and character education has been established by earlier research in moral development and character education, discussed in detail in Chapter 2. Education for democracy is an intentional process aimed at developing the skills and knowledge necessary to function in a democratic society. Character education is an intentional process that promotes a person’s moral functioning. A democratic people must have commitment to the moral foundations of democracy: respect for the rights of others, concern for the common good, voluntary compliance with law, and participation in public life (T. Lickona in Mosher, Kenny, & Garrod, 1994). Thus, education for democracy is crucial to democracy’s future, and in this study’s context, to the future of Ukraine’s democracy.

This study is rooted in theories of moral development and character education. These theories, discussed in detail in Chapter 2, have identified the key elements of the character education process: promotion of a moral atmosphere in the school; role modeling of ethical character by school leaders, teachers, and community members; reflection on and guided discussion of moral issues; participation in direct democracy through school or classroom governance; learning about character through the
curriculum; practice and application of moral reasoning and ethical behaviors; and
inclusion of families, especially parents, in character education (Berkowitz, 1998).

The academic literature on moral education (discussed in detail in the second
chapter) indicates that school leaders and faculty members in educational institutions of
all levels play a key role in establishing a school culture conducive to facilitating the
moral and civic formation of young people. The concept of a school’s moral atmosphere
involves such elements as moral leadership, modeling, school mission and policies, and a
strong sense of a caring community (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003;
Davidson, Lickona, & Khmelkov, 2008a, 2008b; Kohlberg, 1985b; Lickona, 1977;
Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez, 2005; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). Further, Colby
et al. (2003) identified university leadership among the key elements that create an
institutional environment conducive to students’ moral and civic formation.

Scope of the Study

This study covers one of the private, liberal arts universities in Ukraine, with a
clear religious affiliation, as a representative case of the earlier mentioned Ukrainian
higher education institutions with reportedly low or nonexistent levels of corruption.
Recognizing the capacity that university leadership has in creating a positive institutional
moral climate and promoting student moral development, this study explored the beliefs
and views of Ukrainian Catholic University (UCU) leaders in this regard. The study also
investigated the specific ways that the leaders’ beliefs align with the university’s
institutional practices. The study was conducted between 2011 and 2013, and so the
discussion will be primarily situated within the pre-Dignity Revolution time frame (prior
to the first peaceful protests of November 2013). The focus of the study was UCU leadership at various university levels—from the rector’s (provost’s) office to the department chairs. However, study participants also included students, members of the university’s governing board, and members of the broader higher education community in Ukraine.

**Definition of Terms**

Different terms such as *moral, character,* and *civic* are used by the research community to refer to the same process of facilitating moral and civic formation through a deliberate educational process (Lapsley, 2008; Lickona & Davidson, 2008).

*Moral formation* is a process of educating for good character. It consists of three components: formation of moral values, moral reasoning, and moral character (Berkowitz, 1991). In turn, elements of moral character include moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action (Lickona, 1991).

*Moral education* is an intentional process of education for character development (Narvaez, 2005). It is concerned with deliberately cultivating virtue; teaching justice and developing students’ conceptions of fairness, human welfare and rights; and the application of those moral understandings to issues of everyday life (Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Nucci, 1997, 2006; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b).

*Character education* is a term referred to in Ukraine’s national educational policies and K–16 curriculum. It encompasses moral and civic formation, as well as other elements of the national character education framework. For the purposes of the current research, I apply my understanding of moral and character education as a multifaceted
educational process that has at its heart the formation of moral character and civic responsibility. To capture these complexities, I use the term *moral and civic formation* in this study to describe this process.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

This study does not cover the entire field of university-based character education in Ukraine but limits it to one institution, Ukrainian Catholic University. This study was conducted to explore and describe UCU as a case study focusing on its leaders’ views of the moral and civic formation of their undergraduates, in the context of the post-Soviet era. As indicated earlier in this chapter, this university is among a small number of private, religiously affiliated liberal arts schools that emphasize ethical norms and standards, strive to curb corruption, and aim to educate students for moral character and civic engagement. I approach the case of UCU leadership, however, not as a representative case, but as a unique one. The reason for this is that UCU is the only Catholic higher education institution in Ukraine and, for that matter, in the entire post-Soviet space.

This study is also limited to the time the data were collected and analyzed, between 2011 and 2013. Furthermore, the goal of this study was not to evaluate whether or not UCU and its leadership are successful in educating students for moral character, social responsibility, and civic engagement. It aimed specifically to explore the UCU leaders’ views regarding university-based moral and civic formation, understand their underlying belief systems, and analyze how these views aligned with the institutional
practices and processes at UCU. Finally, the motivation for this study was my belief in the transformative capacity of higher education.

**Researcher Perspective**

I came to this project with the conviction that an educational institution could operate ethically and that, under specific conditions, a university in Ukraine could educate ethical individuals and play an important role in Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transformation. In addition, my Christian faith underlies some of my assumptions. The following life experience led to my current perspective.

I grew up in the Ukraine Republic of the Soviet Union, and its educational system was the first one in which I participated, both as a student and as a teacher. I was an undergraduate during the last decade of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, finishing in 1990, one year before Ukraine’s independence. I also began my professional teaching career in 1990, teaching elementary school. I experienced firsthand the devastating economic turmoil and moral degradation in Ukraine that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union. Blatant corruption and what in the West would be considered egregious sexual harassment were becoming common.

In 1995, I obtained a position as an interpreter for an American Presbyterian missionary organization that had begun work in my town. Working closely alongside them, I saw a great difference in how, compared with most of my fellow citizens, they approached everyday situations: with integrity and high ethical standards. I was encouraged to see that people could live by a different set of standards, one that valued and empowered those around them. As a widowed mother, I wanted my child to be able
to be treated with dignity as she grew up. Through working with the missionaries and several other experiences, I became convinced that worldviews other than the Communist Party’s atheism were viable, and in the early 1990s I adopted the Christian worldview, which I have maintained to this day.

In 1997, I immigrated to Canada, where I eventually earned a Master’s degree at Regent College, an interdenominational Protestant graduate school in Vancouver. By living in Canada—and especially through my community-based social justice work, church involvement, and graduate studies—I discovered what a working democracy looked like. I was particularly drawn not only by the participatory aspect and citizen involvement but also by Canadian society’s ability to establish, respect, and abide by social norms and rules. I learned about the historical role the Christian belief system had in developing volunteer service in Canada, as it did also in the United States. While learning about community-based development, participatory democracy, and faith-informed community transformation in the context of western Canada, my desire to transfer my learning experience and make it available and accessible to people in Ukraine grew. Through my community coalition’s partnership with academia and my own experience as a graduate student, I learned how colleges and universities could be active contributors to developing and sustaining democracy.

I became a Canadian citizen in 2003 and, having married a U.S. citizen, I immigrated to the United States that same year. Because of a visit to Ukraine and friendships with Ukrainians I met in the United States, I started becoming aware of the devastating impact of the loss of moral values and deteriorating professional ethics on youth, families, and
Ukrainian society as a whole—particularly in the educational system. The situation affected me in a very personal way through my empathy for one young woman whom I mentored and who had become severely oppressed by Ukraine’s corrupt educational system. It was at this time that I realized how passionate I was about the restoration of justice for ordinary Ukrainians and about building a truly democratic society in Ukraine. The means of international education seemed to be the most appropriate to pursue these goals.

This reflection led to the narrowing of my research area. Drawing on my previous graduate studies in applied theology, and believing that Christian ethics could potentially present an alternative and a viable solution for corruption in Ukraine, I began exploring the involvement of Ukrainian Christian churches and faith-based organizations in policy making aimed to curb the negative impact of moral decline and corruption on youth, families, and communities. I came across stories of isolated successes of faith-informed social action and transformation in Ukraine, as well as the stories collected in communities of the world where Christian believers applied their faith in what is often called transformational development: personal transformation leading to the socioeconomic transformation of local communities. I also discovered two Ukrainian private, nonprofit, Christian universities that aimed not only to be corruption-free zones but also to educate ethical and civically responsible leaders for Ukraine’s young democracy. One of them was UCU.

Having experienced life in Ukraine, on the one hand, and in Canada and the United States, on the other, I believe that I am able to make sense of these two very different cultural contexts. At the same time, I am concerned that my own belief system and North American
experience of living by democratic rules may have led me to an unexamined assumption that it is completely wrong not to always follow Christian ethical values. I came to believe that the ethical values of Christianity and democracy have much in common and that most of the values found in Christian teachings are also shared by democratic societies. This was the main assumption I brought to the current research: that UCU’s goals and Christian practices and ethos for the moral formation of undergraduates could present a means for ending corruption, leading to a more truly democratic society.

**Summary**

In this chapter I presented the purpose and importance of the study. The study’s goal was to explore UCU leaders’ views on university-based moral and civic formation, as well as to understand the leaders’ underlying beliefs and the ways these views and beliefs align with UCU’s institutional practices. I provided an overview of Ukraine’s post-independence higher education context. The research questions were presented, followed by the discussion of the importance, conceptual framework, and the scope of the study. The chapter continued with the definitions of terms and the discussion of the study’s limitations and delimitations. Finally, to consider my own possible biases and ensure the transparency of this research, I concluded this chapter with an overview of the experiences that have informed my thinking about the topic of this study. Chapter 2 provides an in-depth overview of the study’s theoretical framework.
Chapter Two

The goal of this study was to explore UCU leaders’ views on university-based student moral and civic formation and to identify the ways their views informed the university’s organizational mission and practices within the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transition. For this study I collected and analyzed literature on empirical research in moral development and character education. The research literature on moral development and character education has for most of its history been distinguished by two schools of origin: cognitive-development and traditional or values-based. In addition, a third, synthesizing social-cognitive-developmental school has begun to prevail in the literature more recently (Holter & Narvaez, 2011). This study’s conceptual framework is based on these three theoretical schools found in the literature: (a) cognitive-developmental, (b) virtue-based, and (c) social-cognitive-developmental.

Given that there is no consensus among researchers and practitioners on where the dividing line lies between moral development and character education, and given that there is definite interconnectedness and mutual enrichment between the two fields, this study makes use of research on both. This review focuses in particular on the moral development and character education literature that is concerned with democratic citizenship. Finally, I expanded the literature review to include Catholic Social Teaching (CST), which enabled me to better understand the UCU leaders’ beliefs and views.
In this chapter I present an overview of the process of moral formation, derived from these three theoretical schools. It is followed by a discussion of the relationship between moral development and democracy and of the factors critical to the moral character and civic formation of adolescents. To situate the current research, next follows an overview of the literature on moral and civic formation in universities. The chapter concludes with a description of the key concepts of CST and Ignatian pedagogy.

Scope of Literature Reviewed

The literature I reviewed comes from all three theoretical perspectives—cognitive-developmental, virtue-based, and social-cognitive-developmental—and includes the theory of community building and community attachment (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 2008); care theory (Noddings, 2002, 2005, 2008); integrated ethical education theory (Narvaez, 2005); and excellence and ethics theory (Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b). These theories together provide a deeper understanding of moral formation and education and served as an additional lens that theoretically enriched the data collection and analysis for the current study. Thus, the theoretical framework for my study is bound by the cognitive-developmental theory (particularly by Kohlberg’s and neo-Kohlbergian research in Just Community Schools); traditional, values-based theory; and the combined social-cognitive-developmental approach that includes community attachment theory, care theory, and Integrated Ethical Education Theory; and application of these theories to university settings. Within the social-cognitive-developmental school, I specifically examined literature that explores the concepts of community and caring.
relationships and proposes an integrated and comprehensive approach to moral and
character education.

Process Used to Conduct the Literature Search and Analysis

I first explored four volumes that outlined theories of moral development and
their application in moral and character education: *Handbook of Moral Development*
(Killen & Smetana, 2006), *Moral Development and Character Education: A Dialogue*
(Nucci, 1989), *Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (Nucci & Narvaez, 2008),
and *Character Education: The Foundation for Teacher Education* (Williams & Schaps,
1999). I then focused on cognitive-developmental theory and its application: the Just
Community schools approach, traditional values-based approach, and the combination
social-cognitive-developmental approach. I also explored the practical application of
these theories in high school and university settings. Through ancestor search, I sought
out studies and articles cited in the overview volumes that informed my understanding of
these three areas more deeply. Through descendant search, I further focused on the Just
Community Schools approach and work conducted by neo-Kohlbergian researchers
(Power, Higgins-D’Alessandro, Colby, and others), particularly focusing on school moral
climate or moral atmosphere and the institutional aspects of successful moral and civic
formation frameworks in U.S. HEIs. I discovered a similar emphasis on school moral
atmosphere among the researchers who shared values-based and combination approaches
to moral and character education. Finally, within the neo-Kohlbergian and values-based
research on schools’ moral atmospheres, schools’ cultures of ethics and excellence, and
civic formation in the university, I explored the literature for methodologies and research
instruments used in the formative and summative evaluation of schools’ moral and character education processes and looked for elements that could be incorporated into my study’s methodology.

To locate the studies, I used Google Scholar, PsycINFO, ERIC, Education Research Complete, and ProQuest (including ProQuest Digital Dissertations) databases to do keyword, citation, and document text searches for school climate, moral atmosphere, moral formation and university, and moral formation and higher education. I also conducted a cross-search for the key authors’ names to find additional articles on these topics. In addition, to locate literature on CST, I explored the official websites of organizations within the Catholic Church, such as the Church’s dioceses and educational institutions in North America.

**Moral Formation, Moral Character, and Moral Education**

When discussing moral formation as the developmental process that forms moral character, it is important to start with a clear definition of morality. According to Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental approach, morality is viewed as justice (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). According to DeVries and Zan (1994), however, a moral person is someone who not only acts justly and behaves in other prosocial ways but also has developed moral feelings and intentions.

Next, it is important to understand the boundaries and the scope of the moral formation process, as well as the relationship among the elements of moral formation, moral character, and education for moral character identified by previous research. Berkowitz (1991) delineates moral formation as a process consisting of three
components: formation of moral values, of moral reasoning, and of moral character. The first component is the formation of moral values. Moral values are those that uphold the human dignity of any and every human being as the highest standard. These are values that, although found in many religious and philosophical traditions, transcend religions, according to Berkowitz (1991). Chorna (2001) refers to them as shared human values and DeVries & Zan (1994) argue that they can be summarized by the Golden Rule, *Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.* Berkowitz’s second component is the formation of moral reasoning (Berkowitz, 1991). This domain is concerned with the fact that individuals do not simply hold certain values but also interpret and evaluate them in specific situations. Colby and Kohlberg agree that this ability is moral reasoning, and they add that the current level of an individual’s moral reasoning development correlates with capacity for moral judgment and moral behavior (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987; Kohlberg, 1981, 1984).

Berkowitz’s third element of moral formation is moral character, which seems to be the same entity that Lickona (1991) refers to as good character. Lickona, taking the values-based approach, has a somewhat different system from that of Berkowitz, who takes the cognitive-developmental approach. Further in this chapter, I will attempt to synthesize their conclusions. According to Lickona (1991), good character includes three components: moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral doing (to Berkowitz [1991], *moral action*). Moral knowing consists of moral awareness, knowing moral values, being able to take the perspectives of others, moral reasoning, moral decision making, and self-knowledge. Moral feeling, in turn, involves conscience, self-esteem, empathy, loving the
good, self-control, and humility. Moral action is represented by competence, will, and habit (Lickona, 1991). Ryan (1989) and Wynne (1987) present a similar system, in which moral character can be achieved through intentional education focused on the development of moral habits (or virtues) that are later transformed into virtuous (or moral) character.

Other scholars refer to the above three components of moral character—moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral doing—as moral virtues or traits (Lapsley, 2008; Lickona, 1991). In his approach to define virtues, Blasi (2005) differentiated between lower order virtues (or character traits) and higher order virtues. The former include such traits as empathy, compassion, fairness, honesty, generosity, kindness, diligence, and others (Blasi, 2005). Lapsley, continuing Blasi’s direction, argues that these may be described as an individual’s tendencies to respond in a certain way in very specific situations (Lapsley, 2008). Higher order traits consist of two subgroups and can be applied to a wide variety of situations. The first subgroup includes traits reflecting a person’s capacity for self-control and self-regulation in problem solving. These include such virtues as “breaking down problems, goal setting, focusing attention, avoiding distractions, resisting temptation, staying on task, [and] persevering with determination and self-discipline” (Lapsley, 2008, p. 36). The second subgroup is related to an individual’s capacity for integrity (Lapsley; 2008).

Understanding, derived from the previous research and discussed earlier, of the relationship between moral formation and moral character is important to this study. It offers insight into the types of learning outcomes university-based moral formation may
achieve. Also foundational to my research was the discovery of an emerging consensus that education for democratic citizenship requires education for moral formation (Althof & Berkowitz, 2006). As the relationship between the moral formation and democracy is established below, the centrality of university-based education for moral character (in addition to education for moral values and moral reasoning) becomes evident as a key element in educating for democracy.

**Moral Formation and Democracy**

The relationship between education for democracy and education for character has been established by earlier research (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Kohlberg, 1985b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez, 2005; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). Both are intentional processes. Education for democracy aims to develop the skills and knowledge necessary to function in a democratic society, while character education aims to promote individuals’ moral functioning, increasing, for example, their moral reasoning ability and motivation to actively engage in prosocial behaviors (Berkowitz, 1998). The formation of democratic values and behaviors is best explained in the literature by the Just Community Schools approach to moral and character education. According to Kohlberg (1985a, 1985b) and Power et al. (1989a, 1989b), the concept of school moral atmosphere—the component in this approach—is very important to the process of school-based moral education that facilitates the moral as well as democratic formation of a person. Kohlberg’s Just Community Schools approach is a key element of the current study’s theoretical framework. Before summarizing that approach, I need to address the criticism of
Kohlberg’s original work on stages of moral reasoning because these stages are foundational to his Just Community Schools approach.

Kohlberg’s original work on stages of moral reasoning has received extensive criticism. However, studies conducted by post-Kohlbergian researchers (Branch, 2000; Gilligan, 1993; Narvaez, 2005; Rest et al., 1999) address the criticism in terms of the gender and culture of the participants. In addition, to address cultural aspects of moral development in Scandinavia, the Moral Development Scale for Professionals was developed by Skisland, Bjørnestad, and Söderhamn (2012). The findings of these latter studies supported Kohlberg’s moral stages but suggested that the actual age range when individuals would be able to reach each of the stages would differ in various cultural settings.

Also, Kohlberg’s research may seem inapplicable to the current study because it involved students only in the K-12 setting and did not include the young-adult age group typical of university students, who are the focus of this study. However, Kohlberg’s research appears applicable to the current study for two reasons. First, later studies indicated the appropriateness of Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental approach to a higher education setting (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003). Second, Ukrainian undergraduates start their studies one or two years earlier than typical students in the United States, thus falling within late adolescence and increasing the likelihood of the viability of applying Kohlberg’s approach to them.

The values-based approach represented by Lickona (1991) suggests that the first component of a good character, moral knowing, involves development of the moral
reasoning. However, the development of moral reasoning is outlined in Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental theory. There are six stages, including two at each of the three developmental levels, which are preconventional, conventional, and postconventional (Hersh, Miller, & Fielding, 1980; Kohlberg, 1976a, 1978, 1984, 1985a). Critical for a democratic society is individuals’ development at the postconventional level when they reach autonomous selfhood and the ability to live a principled life. According to Power et al. (1989a, 1989b), autonomy means one’s ability to self-govern, and only autonomous individuals are capable of creating and sustaining a truly democratic society.

In the context of this study, it was important to understand previous research findings regarding the feasibility of and the means by which the development of an autonomous self could be facilitated in Ukrainian university setting. According to Power et al. (1989a, 1989b), autonomy is connected with cooperation, and cooperation is a precursor of autonomy. Because an autonomous person is a social person, facilitating the formation of autonomous individuals with moral character and a well-developed sense of civic responsibility is, in fact, a required task for forming democratic citizens.

John Dewey, a proponent of education’s central role in a democratic society, viewed education as an intrinsically moral process concerned not only with acquisition of knowledge and skills but also with learning how to live. In the case of the United States, as well as now in the case of post-Soviet Ukraine, it means learning to live in a democracy. Dewey (1950) argued that democracy was much more than a political form of government. He viewed it as a way of living together, where members of a society have many shared interests and put each other’s freedom and dignity as top priority. They
develop the capacity to live in accordance with shared principles that celebrate the
dignity of every human being.

In the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet transition, Dewey’s view means actively
and strategically engaging all spheres of society in the task of forming democratic
consciousness and behaviors. Because historically the nation’s educational system has
been tasked with the civic and moral formation of individuals, the role of schools,
colleges, and universities is critical to how successful Ukraine will be in achieving its
democratic aspirations. In this section, I explore the key elements of the three theoretical
perspectives on character education, as they relate to the formation of democratic
consciousness in adolescents and young adults.

Kohlberg adopted Dewey’s view of development as the aim of moral education
and shared Dewey’s emphasis on learning by doing (Kohlberg, 1981). He stressed that
being involved in a democratic, cooperative community environment is critical to
learning to live democratically. Through empirical research, Kohlberg redefined and
validated Dewey’s and Piaget’s theoretical ideas on the levels of moral development
(Kohlberg, 1976a, 1976b). Kohlberg’s three major levels correspond with Dewey’s three
levels: preconventional (or premoral), conventional, and autonomous (Kohlberg, 1976a,
1976b). Each of Kohlberg’s three levels—preconventional, conventional, and
postconventional or principled—has two stages, which Kohlberg validated through
longitudinal and cross-cultural studies (Kohlberg, 1976a, 1976b). As Kohlberg (1976a,
1976b) indicated, the change that occurs from stage to stage is a change in moral
reasoning (or judgment) and not in beliefs or values.
The neo-Kohlbergian theorists extended Kohlberg’s theoretical ideas beyond the stages of moral judgment to include broader attributes of moral personality (Narvaez, 2005). They adopted Kohlberg’s emphasis on stages of the development of moral judgment (and the importance of facilitating the move from conventional to post-conventional stages) and on cognitive construction of just (or moral) reasoning. The neo-Kohlbergian theorists have also expanded Kohlberg’s theory, particularly his applied research on the Just Community Schools model, and further developed the concept of schools’ moral climate (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). Universities’ moral climate and developmentally appropriate university-based education for moral character (in addition to education for moral values and moral reasoning) should be considered key elements in educating for democracy.

**Factors Critical to the Moral and Civic Formation of Adolescents**

Students in Ukrainian universities are represented by the 17-22 age group. Thus, for the purposes of this study, factors that previous research suggested impact moral formation of adolescents were considered. Kohlberg argued that the development of moral judgment in individuals is observed when they move from the preconventional to the conventional stage and beyond it. As previous research points out (Narvaez; 2005; Nucci, 2006; Turiel, 1983), the most important growth occurs during adolescence, as a person begins a movement from conventional to postconventional thinking. Studies indicate that developmental differences between preconventional and postconventional types of moral judgment remain consistent in various cultures (Narvaez, 2005). Narvaez (2005) argues that deliberative education focused on critical thinking is important to the
development of explicit postconventional judgment, the highest stage. The type of relationships that Dewey describes depict a true democracy as a society, in which members have achieved the postconventional stage of moral judgment. At the postconventional level, individuals function as autonomous persons who are able to create and live in a society that elevates human dignity as the highest value.

Relationships in which people are conscious of the balance of power (in regard to the dignity of others) are characterized by cooperation, collaboration, and care; children experiencing these relationships learn healthy autonomy. This is particularly important when working with children and youth because they learn by doing (Dewey, 1916). It is only by refraining from unnecessary external control that adults open the way for children to develop internal self-control and moral feelings. Thus, the role of adults is critical to whether a young person develops toward becoming an autonomous individual. This development toward autonomy is specifically facilitated by caring and cooperative relationships, exposure to prosocial values and understanding others, opportunities for interaction with peers and for prosocial action, and the use of moral discussion and of developmental discipline in forming students’ moral reasoning and moral habits (Watson, Solomon, Battistich, Schaps & Solomon, 1989).

Whether individuals become more autonomous or heteronomous is determined by the environment in which they are being raised and by which they are surrounded. The quality of socialization, determined by the moral atmosphere of the home, the school, and the broader society, is the most important aspect in the development of moral character.
Among the essential elements of moral atmosphere are the quality of relationships and the quality of community.

A study by Kohlberg and his colleagues strongly suggests that democratic community and caring relationships within the community and with adults are strong predictors of the moral and civic formation of adolescents (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). Kohlberg extended his theoretical model of moral development to the study of a just and democratic school community, the aforementioned Just Community School (Kohlberg, 1976a, 1976b). Kohlberg (1980) stressed that experience of participation in a school democracy is a necessary aspect of one’s moral and civic development. Reviewing the research literature, Kohlberg pointed out the correlation of participation experiences with the attainment of higher stages of cognitive and moral development. At the same time, higher stages of development can cause higher levels of participation. Providing an opportunity for direct participation in a democratic process thus promotes civic and moral development, as well as facilitating the readiness of high school students for participation in democratic society (Kohlberg, 1980).

In Just Community Schools, educators create an environment that allows students and adults to become active participants in a democratically functioning community. Such experience of participatory democracy in Just Community Schools facilitates the development of higher stages of moral judgment (Kohlberg, 1976b; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b; Power & Higgins-D’Alessandro, 2008). According to Lapsley (2008), schools that follow the Just Community approach create a community with a commitment to participatory democracy, which, through service, becomes a moral community. Schools
embracing this approach view students and faculty as members of a community in which each member commits to a common life that is regulated by shared moral ideals. The Just Community Schools approach includes such elements as students making decisions about real life actions that affect the school’s functioning and survival as a community; students collaboratively developing community rules and taking responsibility for the rules through community discipline based on reasoning and discussion about fairness; and students being challenged by teachers about their views, reasoning, and actions (Kohlberg, 1985a). Kohlberg placed emphasis on the non-indoctrinative nature of this approach and called it socialization (adopting the term from Durkheim [1973]). Kohlberg (1985a, 1985b) placed at the center of this model the principles of social justice that would be agreed upon in a democratic manner in a community meeting.

Further, students in Just Community Schools experience caring relationships with educators (teachers as well as school staff). The quality of the relationship is achieved by authentic care and deliberative noncoercive use of power (Noddings, 2008). Such relationships with important adults facilitate the moral development and formation of an autonomous individual (Power et al., 1989b) and, simultaneously, are instrumental in building a strong school community. In the classroom, cooperative relationships, modeling by the teacher, the use of developmental discipline (Battistich, 2008; Narvaez, 2005; Nucci, 2008), exposure to a moral climate, and teachers’ examples teach students to value the dignity of others, to care, and to act justly. Additionally, school bonding and creation of caring school communities may meet the developmental need for secure attachment and, through attachment to teachers and staff and a strong sense of
community, facilitate the development of moral judgment and moral character (Lapsley & Narvaez, 2006).

Caring school community is a developmentally important factor in adolescents’ moral formation not only because it fulfills the need for secure attachment (Pratt, Hansberger, Pancer & Alisat, 2003), but also because community is a venue for development of moral identity. According to Hart, Matsubara, and Atkins (2008), moral identity formation seems to increase when opportunities for moral action are provided. This underscores the importance of providing youth with opportunities for learning through community service (Hart et al., 2008). A longitudinal study conducted by Pratt et al. (2003) demonstrated the power of community involvement, suggesting that community engagement was a predictor for subsequent endorsement of a moral self-ideal.

Further, research points to a positive correlation between students’ moral development and involvement in community service (Hart, Atkins, & Donnelly, 2006). The research of Hart et al. (2006) using the National Educational Longitudinal Survey suggests the importance of moral attitudes in motivating voluntarism and community service in youth in the United States (Hart et al., 2006). Similar findings emerged from the studies of international youth (Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapó, & Sheblanova, 1998; Yates & Youniss, 1999). Youth with more developed moral judgment have a higher likelihood for becoming volunteers in the community (Comunian & Gielen, 1995; Hart et al., 2006). Research suggests not only that youth with more developed moral attitudes and moral judgment tend to be more active in their civic participation, but that
youth participation in volunteer service is a predictor of youth developing higher stages of moral reasoning and moral attitudes (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Boss, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Franz & McClelland, 1994; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Hart et al., 2006; Leming, 2001; Nassi, 1981).

The school community characteristics described earlier, such as a caring atmosphere, strong sense of community, balance between the power dynamics of a truly democratic community and that of democratic governance, and community engagement through service within the school and broader community constitute the school’s moral atmosphere (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Lee, 2008; Narvaez, 2005; Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989a, 1989b). Moral atmosphere also refers to such features of the classroom as autonomy, belonging, competence, and fairness (Nucci, 2008). In addition, school moral atmosphere refers to the institution's entire culture of collaboration and cooperation; the institution's sense of identity, mission, vision, and policies; and to ethical leadership able to create and maintain a mission-driven, democratic, transformational organization (Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Glanzer & Ream, 2008; Lee, 2008). It plays an important role in promoting the development of moral character in the students and positively correlates with prosocial behaviors and negatively with antisocial (Brugman, Heymans, Boom, Podolskij, Karabanova, & Idobaeva, 2003; Power et al., 1989b). According to Kohlberg (1981), a school’s moral atmosphere is the link between moral judgment and moral action. To facilitate students’ moral formation, as Lickona (1991) argues, the whole culture of the school must support the development of good character: of moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action. It is important to note
that such alignment of institutional culture with the goal of student moral formation would call for a commitment of university leaders.

Previous research suggests that university leaders can drive the process of civic and moral formation in universities (Colby et al., 2003). Furthermore, ethical leadership plays a critical role in today’s society (Johnson, 2004); indeed, some argue that “[t]he course of any society is largely determined by the quality of its moral leadership” (Colby and Damon, 1994, pp. 18-19). Teachers and school administrators are among the first leaders that children encounter. The way in which they model moral behavior is an important element contributing to students’ moral formation. Teachers model moral behavior in their actions toward their students (Hersh et al., 1980; Lickona, 1977). Kohlberg’s research in the Just Community approach (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b) indicates that in a school run as a direct democracy, modeling of advocacy by teachers was critical to the success of direct democratic governance in these schools (Berkowitz, 1991). A study on the ethical formation of medical students (Miles, Lane, Bickel, Walker, & Cassel, 1989; Pellegrino, 1989) suggested that the effectiveness of medical ethics education depends on senior physicians’ exemplifying in their work and teaching the ideals of an ethical physician.

Now that I have outlined the relationship between moral formation, moral character, and democracy, and have described the elements of universities’ moral climate as the basis for developmentally appropriate university-based education for moral character, moral values, and moral reasoning, the next section presents previous research on how moral and civic formation of university students can be facilitated.
Fostering the Moral and Civic Formation of University Students

To be effective, first, learning for moral and civic formation should be designed as an integrated process across the academic curriculum, as well as in extracurricular programming (Colby et al., 2003). According to Berkowitz and Fekula (1999), the postsecondary character education process involves teaching about character through academic instruction and espoused values; modeling character, in individuals and institutional policies and behavior; setting and enforcing standards for ethical academic practices and behaviors; providing opportunities for practicing character though democratic governance, community service, and experiential learning; and reflecting on one’s own character. Berkowitz (1991) argued that the pedagogical practice of character education should impact students’ moral values systematically.

First, these values should be modeled by the individual faculty members and staff. Second, the values must be espoused through deliberately designed teaching processes and teaching practices. Faculty can facilitate reflection on diverse points of view, create an environment that allows for exploration and challenge of different values, assist students in forming valuing skills, and increase their capacity for moral judgment (Berkowitz, 1991). Moral reasoning is promoted through peer discussion and debate of moral dilemmas and dialogue on different value positions (Berkowitz, 1991; Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b). Third, moral character formation can be facilitated through the creation of an environment in which students are direct participants in a democracy (in a class or a school) with an emphasis on justice and community (Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b), because school-fostered direct democracy is a means of educating for
a just society (Kohlberg, 1976a, 1976b). The role of the faculty and school administrators is to model (Berkowitz, 1991) and facilitate student engagement in the direct democratic process and to be advocates for strong community purposed toward justice.

Finally, Berkowitz (1991) observed that to truly impact students’ moral development, the moral education process must involve institutional elements beyond the curriculum. It should be manifested by the moral atmosphere of the school, caring relationships among individuals, and institutional policies that have at their core the goal of an overall climate that fosters and requires mutual respect (Berkowitz, 1991). It is also illustrated by the school’s investment policies, institutional processes, governance structure, and personnel practices. For this reason, the school’s human resources, government structure, policies, and institutional values should be carefully considered. Therefore, it was also important to examine previous studies regarding the central role of university leaders in creating and leading institutional efforts toward students’ civic and moral formation.

Previous research indicates that university leaders’ belief that students can be educated for ethics and morality is conducive to facilitating students’ moral and civic formation, because it often leads to the thoughtful creation of educational frameworks that help students maximize their potential for moral growth (Maldonado et al., 2007). Research also indicates that university leaders can facilitate, via institutional processes and policies, undergraduate students’ education to become democratic citizens, leading lives of moral and civic responsibility (Colby et al., 2003). The knowledge of this
important role of university leaders became foundational to the development of my research.

Figure 2. Theoretical Framework

Catholic Social Teaching and Jesuit Pedagogy

The theoretical framework for this study (Figure 2) is rooted in previous research and literature in moral development and character education. However, during the interviews, UCU leaders encouraged me to review additional literature and research the key concepts of Catholic Social Teaching (CST) to better understand their views. In addition, while reviewing CST literature, I discovered Jesuit pedagogy, a well-developed
Catholic pedagogy of social justice education. CST literature and Jesuit pedagogy enlightened my understanding of this study’s findings, further explained UCU leaders’ philosophical framework, and helped my understanding of the UCU leaders’ perspective. CST elements were later added to the study’s conceptual framework. For all these reasons, it is important to present the results of this additional literature review.

**Overview of Catholic Social Teaching.** CST is a philosophical framework of the Roman Catholic Church that guides its engagement with the world, particularly on the matters of social, economic, and environmental justice. With roots found in the Bible and later developed by Catholic thinkers, CST can be summarized in the following seven themes: The life and dignity of the human person.

1. Call to family, community, and participation.
2. Rights and responsibilities; social justice.
3. An option for the poor and vulnerable.
4. The dignity of work and the rights of workers.
5. Solidarity: the common good.
6. Care of God’s creation.
7. Care of God’s creation.

For the purpose of the current overview, these CST themes have been grouped into two categories: (a) respect for and value of the life and dignity of the human being and (b) solidarity, inclusion, community, and the common good.

At the heart of Christian teaching, and of CST in particular, is belief in the life and dignity of the human being. It views every human being as a person, endowed by God with dignity, intelligence, and free will. This principle requires that policies,
organizations, and actions are assessed by whether they uphold and enhance human
dignity (Krier Mich, 2011). Stemming from their identity as bearers of the divine image
who live in solidarity and unity with their creator, human beings are called to resemble
the union existing in the divine persons of the Trinity—the union of truth and love—in
their relationship with other human beings. Pope John Paul II has described solidarity as
a Christian virtue and a person’s unwavering commitment to the common good (John
Paul II, 1987). Solidarity, according to CST, can be learned only through personally
encountering it through a direct experience (Bergman, 2011). Solidarity rises from
affective experiences and personal involvement with injustice and innocent suffering, and
it may challenge one’s thinking and behaviors and be a catalyst for critical reflection and
personal change (Kolvenbach, 2005).

**Jesuit pedagogy of social justice.** The formation of virtuous persons, who value
the human dignity of all and possess a well-developed sense of social responsibility, is,
therefore, the focus of Catholic higher education, and such education is intrinsic to the
Church’s mission. Its task is to form members of a new community brought forward by
the Holy Spirit. Community is the goal and is also an environment and a mechanism for
virtue and character formation, as discussed earlier in this chapter. Being a Christian
means to be part of a family, an eschatological community—the Church—and one only
learns how to be a part of that family through other-focused, habit-forming practices
facilitated by and within the context of the Christian community (Wright, 2009). The
character forming work of the church is intended to form “persons who are capable of
morally responsible citizenship rooted in independent thought” (Paeth, 2010, p. 168).
This brings us to the question of how, according to CST, moral character is to be formed within the context of Christian educational institutions.

CST addresses issues of justice from the philosophical perspective. However, some Catholic educators applied CST concepts to develop a pedagogy of social justice. One of them, Bergman (2011), pointed out that contemporary cultural values of individualism, materialism, and consumerism, as well as the quality of schooling and influence of mass media, are damaging to human persons and contrary to the fundamental Christian (i.e., Catholic) value of human life and dignity. Education therefore should play a key role in forming a new kind of citizen, motivated by a countercultural set of values and capable of upholding the dignity of all and promoting justice. According to CST, the purpose and mission of education is this kind of personal transformation (Bergman, 2011).

The process and methods of such a transformational pedagogy have been articulated by the Jesuit tradition in Catholic education: Ignatian pedagogy. This pedagogical framework for teaching and learning consists of three elements: experience, reflection, and action. According to Kolvenbach (2005), the curriculum must be age appropriate and in line with Christian principles, and incorporate justice issues, critical social analysis, and scenarios of solutions. The second dimension, similarly to Berkowitz (1991), should involve institutional policies and programs, which should model values that are contrary to those of a consumer society (Kolvenbach, 2005). Finally, the third dimension involves active engagement in the works of justice to facilitate critical social
analysis and reflection, “based on actual contact with the structural dimensions of injustice” (Kolvenbach, 2005, para. 80).

**Summary**

Chapter 2 provided a summary of the research literature relevant to the study. The previous research on moral development and character education is important because it provides insights regarding the developmentally appropriate structuring of educational processes and learning environments that could successfully promote ethical formation in a school or university setting. The research suggests not only that university-based civic and ethical formation is feasible but also that, if incorporated into institutional mission and culture, it could successfully facilitate the formation of ethical and civically responsible democratic citizens.

For the purposes of the current study, Kohlberg’s later work on the Just Community Schools is important because it suggests that elements of the educational environment and educational processes enable and facilitate the development of individuals with higher moral reasoning who are more likely to participate in democratic processes. Similarly, social-cognitive and values-based approaches have also identified school climate and ethical culture as being instrumental to establishing an institutional climate of integrity and excellence. The concept of school moral atmosphere and its elements such as moral leadership, modeling, school mission and policies, and a strong sense of a caring community are important to my study. While reviewing the literature, I discovered that, in addition to its appearance in the Just Community Schools approach, this theme was also present in the work of Narvaez (2005), in the values-based approach.
(Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008), and in the application of the cognitive-developmental approach to civic and moral formation in higher education (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003).

Previous research reviewed in this chapter suggests that the key elements of an effective character education process are promotion of a moral atmosphere in the school; role modeling of ethical character by school leaders, teachers, and community members; reflection on and guided discussion of moral issues; participation in direct democracy through school or classroom governance; learning about character through the curriculum; practice and application of moral reasoning and ethical behaviors; and the inclusion of families, especially parents, in character education (Berkowitz, 1998).

Finally, this chapter presented key elements of Catholic Social Teaching, a philosophical framework UCU leaders have referred to during interviews.

The next chapter offers a discussion of the methods employed in conducting the current study. First, the research questions are introduced. Second, the research design is described. Third, the methods and procedures are reviewed, including a description of the setting and participants, researcher assumptions and bias, data collection, and analysis. Last, issues of validity, ethics, and limitations of this study are considered.
Chapter Three

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research methods applied in this study, provide a rationale for using the specific research design, and define the scope and limitations of the research design. The goal of this study was to explore the UCU leaders’ views of university-based student moral and civic formation. In addition, it aimed to identify the ways their views informed the university’s organizational mission and practices within the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transition. Prior to the beginning, George Mason University’s Institutional Review Board approved this qualitative case study on 03.02.2011. This allowed the research to proceed without requiring interview participants to sign a consent document. Interviews for the study were completed between 03.05.2011 and 05.20.2011 with university document review continuing throughout the interview and analysis process.

There is no standard format for case study research (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, care was taken to write the narratives in such a manner that the emerging data were clear and provided an easily understood description of the case study university’s context, leaders’ views, and organizational practices and policies on student moral and civic formation.
Research Questions

The current study is an exploratory, instrumental single-case study of UCU leadership. The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How do UCU leaders describe the values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university and how do these values and beliefs align with the university’s policies and practices?

2. How do UCU leaders understand UCU’s institutional role in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

3. How do UCU leaders view their leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation?

4. How do UCU leaders view UCU’s institutional role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduates and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

Research Design

This study of UCU leadership used the qualitative case study research method. The single-case study of UCU leadership with embedded design was appropriate because the case of UCU leadership was revelatory (Yin, 2009) of UCU leaders’ beliefs, views explored in the study’s four research questions. The research questions were aligned with three spheres: the UCU leadership case, the UCU organization, and Ukraine’s national context.
Case study. The case study method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stake, 1995, 2005; Yin, 2009) was chosen for this study because it was the most appropriate method for answering the study’s questions. The purpose of qualitative research is to understand and explain participant meaning (Morrow & Smith, 2000). The study focused on understanding and describing the phenomenon of UCU leadership within its national and organizational context. A qualitative case study was used to explore and describe UCU leaders’ beliefs and views on the university-facilitated process of undergraduate students’ moral and civic formation. I explored the alignment of the leaders’ views with organizational mission and practices within the broader context of contemporary Ukraine and the country’s higher education policies. I employed Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) structure for case study, which includes review of the problem, the context, the issues, and lessons and insights gained.

The qualitative research method allowed for portraying in detail the complexities (Patton, 2015) of UCU’s leaders’ beliefs and views and their alignment with institutional mission practices. The study involved, first, a detailed exploration and description of the national context and, second, discovery of the views of UCU leaders and alignment of these leaders’ views with UCU’s mission and practices within the broader context of Ukraine.

This qualitative study assumed that the researcher was the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Although this study used a set of preset categories found in literature on character education (Chapter 2; Appendix B) to guide the exploration, the research process was inductive. I was also led by the emerging data from this study that
were collected and analyzed through variety of inductive techniques, described later. I collected the data through interviews with participants, examination of documents, media artifacts, analytical memos, and field notes.

The work of Lincoln and Guba (1985), Patton (2015), Stake (1995), and Yin (2009) on case study as research methodology has informed my choice of methods in the following ways. Following Yin’s (2009) recommendations on determining the suitability of using case study as a research method, I determined, based on my research questions, the absence of the need to control for behaviors, and the study’s focus on the contemporary events in Ukraine and UCU, that case study was a suitable research method was suitable. In addition, Yin’s (2009) definition of the case study scope was helpful in ensuring the correct choice of research method. The scope of the current study included investigation of the contemporary phenomenon of UCU leadership in depth and within its real life context of UCU and contemporary Ukraine, echoing Yin’s (2009) description of case study in that sometimes the boundaries between the UCU leadership phenomenon and its institutional and national context were not clearly evident. Yin’s (2009) illustrations of case study use for exploratory and descriptive purposes helped me to determine that the current study was both exploratory and descriptive. Stake’s (1995, 2005) distinction between intrinsic and instrumental case study offered even deeper insight into the case of UCU leadership, which in some aspects was intrinsic and in others instrumental. Finally, the use of qualitative research was appropriate in this study, because the primary purpose of the study was to generate knowledge (Patton, 2015) about the case that would offer a detailed portrayal of UCU leadership.
The case study research design allowed for in-depth study of UCU leadership in its institutional and national context. Case study methodology is typically used when researchers need tools for investigating a complex phenomenon within its context (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2009). The case of UCU leadership was nested within the context of this university, and the university’s organizational vision, mission, and practices were informed by and directed toward its immediate sociopolitical context of post-Soviet Ukraine. Therefore, the design of this study is a single-case qualitative case study (Yin, 2009). Although several universities were initially considered for this study, the case of UCU was chosen for several reasons. First, it was representative of private Christian universities (although there are a small number of these schools) in their ethical and in their countercultural stand within the contemporary Ukrainian sociopolitical environment (Glanzer & Ream, 2009; Osipian, 2007; Stetar et al., 2005). Second, a variety of data sources on UCU were available and accessible (albeit from a distance) for the purposes of this study.

This is an exploratory, single-case study of the leadership views and practices of UCU. Exploratory research is appropriate when a researcher has limited experience with or knowledge of the phenomenon. The exploratory approach also provided an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon and laid the foundation for future study of the subject. This is an intrinsic case (Stake, 1995) because the researcher had a genuine interest in this specific case and sought to better understand the case. The study’s primary intent was not to explore this case because it represented other cases or illustrated a common trait. The UCU leadership case itself was of primary interest (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 549).
It is also an instrumental case (Stake, 1995, 2005), because it not only explored the UCU leaders’ views and their alignment with institutional action toward moral and civic formation in UCU but also enabled the researcher to focus on a specific issue and then choose a case that illuminates or illustrates that issue (Creswell, 2011). The specific issue in this study is the UCU leaders’ beliefs and views on university-based student moral and civic formation and on a university’s role in Ukraine’s broader sociopolitical context, as well as alignment of their views with the university’s organizational mission and practices. In addition, context played an important role for not only situating the case but also understanding the contextual aspects that informed UCU leaders’ views and motivated them to act in certain ways. This case “provides an insight” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 549) into the bigger issue of Ukraine’s post-Soviet context. It “plays [a] supportive role, facilitating understanding of something else” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 549). I sought to understand why this case was important in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine, particularly for the country’s democratic development.

**Embedded design.** This case study design was aligned with the research questions and included three spheres—the sphere of the UCU leadership case, the UCU organizational sphere, and the sphere of Ukraine’s national context (Figure 3). In the inner sphere of the UCU leadership case, the study explored and described UCU leaders’ (a) values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university, (b) views on leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation, (c) views on university’s role in moral and civic formation of undergraduate students, and (d) views on UCU’s institutional role in the broader context of post-Soviet Ukraine. In the UCU organizational sphere, the study
explored and described how UCU leaders’ values and views on the university’s role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduate students align with the university’s mission and practices. Finally, in the outer sphere of Ukraine’s national context, the study explored Ukrainian national higher education policies pertaining to the character education (including moral and civic formation) of undergraduate students in Ukraine’s post-Soviet context.

![Embedded Case Study Design](image)

*Figure 3. Embedded Case Study Design.* Each colored band represents a different sphere of data collection and analysis. The UCU leadership case is embedded within the broader organizational and national contexts.
Participant Selection

A total of 17 study participants were recruited for the study. Four participants were selected to explore in the national context sphere Ukraine’s higher education policies pertaining to character education (which encompasses moral and civic formation). Seven UCU leaders and an additional six participants were selected for the UCU organizational sphere and seven UCU leaders for the leadership case sphere (Table 1). The participants ranged from 19 to over 65 years. The key selection criteria were the participants’ leadership roles within UCU, roles as UCU students, or positions as researchers or practitioners of university-based character education in Ukrainian higher education. Males and females occupy positions of leadership and administration in Ukrainian higher education, so male and female participants were represented in the study. The participant recruitment telephone script (Appendix C) was used to make the initial recruitment phone calls.
Table 1
*Number of Interviewees by Participant Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type and Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education and</td>
<td>(1) Leader, research institute within the Ukrainian Academy of Educational Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Education</td>
<td>(2) Assistant Provost on Character Education, University in North Eastern Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators and</td>
<td>(3) Department chair, Social Pedagogy, and professor of applied social pedagogy, university in Southern Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers: National</td>
<td>(4) Recently hired at UCU Assistant Provost on Character Education—previously involved in national research and activism in advocating for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context and Policy Sphere (4)</td>
<td>university-based character and civic formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leaders: UCU Leadership</td>
<td>(1) Vice Provost (VP) Responsible for strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case and Organizational</td>
<td>(2) Department Chair, Applied Social Pedagogy; (3) First VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere (7)</td>
<td>(4) VP for Character Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Dean, School of Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) VP for Mission and Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCU Academic Leaders:</td>
<td>(1) VP in a private university in central Ukraine, former Vice Minister of Education and Science of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sphere (2)</td>
<td>(2) VP in a large public university in Western Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Organizational</td>
<td>(1) Female 4th year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere (4)</td>
<td>(2) Female 3rd year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Male 4th year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Female 3rd year student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recruitment of Participants for the National Policy Context Sphere**

For the national context sphere, I recruited three higher education administrators and research faculty with expertise in character education. These participants included
members of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine (APS), some of whom serve in APS leadership positions in character education research. The participants also included current and former non-UCU university faculty members responsible for university-based character education. Profiles of all participants were compiled to place their responses in the context of who they are and their role as researchers and administrators within Ukraine’s system of higher education. I identified these participants through purposeful (in particular, snowballing or chain) sampling (Patton, 2015). I identified cases of interest from interviewees, who knew others that would inform the UCU leadership case. I contacted these three participants because they were familiar with the process of character education and character formation within Ukraine’s system of education through their administrative work and research and were also knowledgeable about the process of higher education policy development (particularly in the area of character education) and its implementation process within Ukraine’s higher education institutions. This firsthand knowledge and experience were important to clarify current national policies and to gain an in-depth understanding of the typical process of students’ character education within Ukraine’s higher education institutions.

One of the participants was the vice director of the Institute of Special Pedagogy, a former participant of the Library of Congress Open World Program whom I had met during the program orientation session in April 2010. Later, we spoke on the telephone about the possibility of developing a research and professional development partnership between the Institute and U.S. universities. At that time, she volunteered to participate in this research and to connect me with another potential participant. This second participant
was a vice provost responsible for character education in a large state university in eastern Ukraine. The third participant, recruited through the second participant and also affiliated with the APS, was a long-term administrative and research faculty member at a university in southwestern Ukraine. This participant was my former instructor, whose research background on student development and character formation, as well as on social pedagogy in Ukraine, were key factors in my selection. In addition, to the policy clarification interview participants, an expert adviser was recruited for this study for the purpose of clarifying character education context and process within Ukraine’s public universities. Formerly a higher educator from another Lviv-based university, he had served as a vice dean for character education and had been directly engaged in implementing the nationally mandated task of student character education. Recently relocated to the United States, he now serves as a policy consultant in a Washington-based think tank. Because of his past residence in Lviv and his connections’ employment at UCU, he was knowledgeable about UCU’s impact in the city of Lviv and beyond. In addition, this individual was recently employed as character education administrative faculty at a university in western Ukraine. This participant served as an expert for the context-related policy interview component of the current study. In particular, he clarified the intricacies of university-based character education in Ukraine for the background of this study and reviewed the context-related findings.

**Recruitment of UCU Leaders for the Sphere of UCU Leadership Case**

The seven study participants were leaders and administrators of Ukrainian Catholic University. They had been identified through purposeful sampling in order to
answer the first research question in this study. I made the initial contact with UCU’s rector (equivalent to provost) during his presentation at the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation in Washington, DC, in November 2010. At that time, he verbally consented to participate in this study. Earlier, in April 2010, I had met UCU’s vice rector of vision and mission during his visit to the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation. Other UCU leaders were identified through UCU’s website. Given the highly relational culture of Ukrainian society, the remaining identified participants were formally recruited as the study began, through a personal reference and invitation from the rector and vice rector. In order to schedule the initial interview, the rector was contacted by e-mail. The UCU leaders were identified through snowballing and through exploring the university’s organizational references found on the school’s website. I also requested that the rector extend the invitation to the remaining six participants in the UCU leadership. Personal e-mail introduction by the UCU’s rector or vice rector was then followed by an e-mail (and sometimes additional Skype phone call) from me to introduce new participants to the study and schedule an interview. I then contacted these participants through Skype or by telephone to discuss the goals of the study and the role they would play in it, as well as to arrange the time for the interview.

**Recruitment of Participants for the Organizational Sphere**

Participants were identified through a combination of snowballing and purposeful sampling to include the same seven UCU leaders, four current students, and two non-UCU academic community representatives familiar with UCU’s organizational engagement with the broader community. In addition to the sphere of UCU leadership
In this case, UCU leaders were involved in the organizational sphere of this study. I also recruited four current students in their 3rd or 4th year of study and two non-UCU academic leaders. The snowballing method was used to recruit these study participants. In the process of my interviews with the UCU leaders, they were asked to help identify potential students from the UCU School of Humanities and non-UCU academic participants. For the latter, I requested to include, if possible, former or current UCU board members or government education officials familiar with UCU through their direct or indirect engagement with the university.

One of the seven UCU leaders, the newly hired UCU Vice Rector for Character Education (tasked with leading the university-based process of students’ moral and civic formation), had previously worked in Ukraine’s MES. He devoted much of his research and educational leadership career to exploring the role of higher education in student ethical and civic formation. This participant contributed to both the organizational and national context spheres, as well as to the leadership case sphere of data collection and analysis for this research.

The remaining two participants from the non-UCU academic community who occupied higher education leadership positions were recruited through snowballing. One of these participants was the former Vice Minister of Education, who was serving as a university leader at another higher education institution. The second of the two participants was a former member of the UCU senate and an associate provost at a large, state-owned university in western Ukraine. She provided information on Ukrainian
character education policy mechanisms and typical university-based character education processes.

**Procedures**

Individual interviews took place over Skype using voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) without video or using a long-distance telephone call. The participants were either in their homes or offices equipped with a computer that had an Internet connection. Several interviews had to be completed or conducted in their entirety by telephone because of a poor or unavailable Internet connection. For example, a call would start via Skype VoIP and about halfway through would be interrupted. Then, through Skype’s text dialogue feature, I would communicate with the participant regarding the best telephone number to dial at that time and would call back to complete the interview. This, however, did not have an impact on the research, because telephone and Skype are equally available in Ukraine for long-distance and international voice calling. Since I had previously met just two of the study participants, the telephone was used on a number of occasions to schedule the initial call and to conduct interviews, a method identified by these participants as a preferred way of communication. The length of each interview was approximately 1 hour.

**Data Sources and Data Collection**

Data were collected from multiple primary sources. These data sources were chosen to provide multiple perspectives, to provide a fuller description of the case, and for the purposes of data triangulation. The data were collected for multiple embedded spheres (Table 2) using examining, inquiring, and memo-cataloging as data collection
methods (Wolcott, 2002). Data collection methods corresponded with the UCU leadership case and with context analysis. Figure 4 depicts the sequence of data collection.

Table 2
Data Sources for Each Embedded Sphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded Spheres</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leaders’ Views</td>
<td>▪ UCU leader interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ University website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Media artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Recorded public interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Organizational Mission &amp; Practices:</td>
<td>▪ UCU leader interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalization of Leaders’ Views</td>
<td>▪ Student interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Non-UCU academic leader interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ University documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Media artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Higher Education Policy Context</td>
<td>▪ National policy documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Interviews with APS-affiliated researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection (Figure 4) began with review of Ukraine’s national educational and higher education policy documents available on the MES website. This was followed by examination of artifacts and national character policy documents. In addition, media artifacts (news websites and MES announcements) were examined for policy developments in postsecondary institution-based character education. Data collection for the sphere of UCU leaders’ case followed and included (a) interviews with UCU leaders, (b) artifacts, and (c) memos as cataloguing during examination of artifacts and during interviews and later during analysis of interviews. Finally, for the sphere of UCU organizational context, the data were collected from (a) interviews with seven UCU
leaders, (b) interviews with four UCU students, (c) artifacts and institutional documents, (d) interviews with two non-UCU academic leaders, and (e) analytical memos written during interviews as cataloging.

To understand the policy context for moral and civic formation in Ukrainian higher education institutions, I reviewed Ukraine’s national educational policies in the area of character development and the moral, ethical, and civic formation of higher education students. To access publicly available policy documents that currently guide character education within Ukraine’s higher education, I downloaded the texts via the Internet. Some of the documents were included in a hard copy of a character educators’ policy sourcebook annually distributed to secondary and postsecondary character education administrators. I obtained a copy from the administration of my high school (Sourcebook, 1996). These documents included laws, MES memorandums, official government statements, and data from the relevant government-sponsored research (Table 3).

Table 3
Documents Analyzed for the Sphere of National Higher Educational Policy Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Enacted</th>
<th>Policy Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>• Education Act [Zakon Ukrains’koi RSR ‘Pro Osvitu’].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>• State National Program ‘Education’ [Derzhavna Natsional’na Prohrama ‘Osvita’ (Ukraina XXI Stolittia)].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1996         | • Constitution of Ukraine.  
               • Education Act: Changes and additions to the 1991 Education Act [Zakon Ukrainy pro Vnesennia Zmin I Dopovnen’ do Zakonu Ukrainskoi RSR ‘Pro Osvitu’]. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Enacted</th>
<th>Policy Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>• Concept of character education of children and youth in the national educational system [Kontseptsiya vyhovannya ditei ta molodi v natsional’niy systemi osvity].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2002         | • National Doctrine for the Development of Education [Natsional’na Doctryna Rozvytky Osvity].  
• Decree # 258 of the President of Ukraine. Regarding the urgent additional measures toward strengthening morality in society and promoting healthy lifestyle. |
| 2008         | • Ministry of Education and Science Draft of Consultations with Vice Rectors for Character Education. |
| 2009         | • Concept of National Character Education of Student Youth [Kontsepcija vyhovannya students; koji molodi]. |

To clarify the meaning of the existing policies and the interviewees’ perspective, I conducted unstructured interviews—a format that placed little structure by posing open-ended questions. This approach allowed the interviewees to guide the discussion into dimensions of their choice, while remaining within the bounds of the topic of national policy on moral and civic formation. Since interviewees’ perspectives were informed by their professional roles and the immediate context in their organizations and cities, unstructured interviews seemed the best way for such broad exploration. Table 4 reflects the number of the interview participants by the type of participant and the interview type. Data collection followed with telephone interviews with three Ukrainian higher educators outside of UCU directly involved in university-based student character education for the purposes of policy and context clarification. These interview questions were informed by the data that emerged from the analysis of policy documents. The interview guide
consisted of a preliminary set of nine open-ended interview questions developed for context explanation purposes (Appendix D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview type</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Length (hours: minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context 1</td>
<td>Leader, research institute within the Ukrainian Academy of Educational Sciences</td>
<td>03.10.2011</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context 2</td>
<td>Assistant Provost on Character Education, University in North Eastern Ukraine</td>
<td>03.16.2011</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context 3</td>
<td>Social Pedagogy Department Chair and professor of applied social pedagogy, university in Southern Ukraine</td>
<td>03.18.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context 4</td>
<td>Recently hired UCU leader previously involved in national research and activism in advocating for university-based character and civic formation</td>
<td>04.21.2011</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 1</td>
<td>Vice Provost (VP) responsible for strategy development</td>
<td>03.29.2011</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04.11.2011</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 2</td>
<td>Applied Social Pedagogy Department Chair</td>
<td>03.29.2011</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview type</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Interview Date</td>
<td>Length (hours: minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 3</td>
<td>First VP</td>
<td>03.31.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 4</td>
<td>VP responsible for character education</td>
<td>04.06.2011</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 5</td>
<td>Dean, School of Humanities</td>
<td>04.21.2011</td>
<td>35 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 5</td>
<td>Dean, School of Humanities</td>
<td>04.14.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 6</td>
<td>VP responsible for mission</td>
<td>04.14.2011</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU Leader 7</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>04.19.2011</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCU Leader 1</td>
<td>VP in a private university in central Ukraine, former Vice Minister of Education and Science of Ukraine</td>
<td>04.26.2011</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCU Leader 2</td>
<td>VP in large national university in western Ukraine</td>
<td>04.26.2011</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>Female 4th year student.</td>
<td>04.01.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>Female 3rd year student</td>
<td>04.14.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>Male 4th year student</td>
<td>05.12.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>Female 3rd year student</td>
<td>04.29.2011</td>
<td>1 hr 25 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step in data collection involved data for the UCU Leadership Case. Semi-structured interviews with UCU leaders were conducted and consisted of three parts: philosophical views of each individual leader, organizational alignment of the leaders’ philosophy within the university’s institutional and academic frameworks, and theoretical aspects of leadership. These elements also correspond to the three aspects of leadership within the UCU leadership case (Figure 5). Data obtained from the second part
of the semi-structured interviews with UCU leaders were used to explore the alignment of leaders’ views on university-based student moral and civic formation with organizational mission and practices.

![UCU Leadership Case: Aspects of Leadership](image)

*Figure 5. UCU Leadership Case: Aspects of Leadership. Three distinctive yet overlapping aspects of leadership were explored in the UCU leadership case. The figure is green to represent that it is the innermost layer of the embedded design, the UCU leadership case found in Figure 3.*

I conducted interviews with seven UCU leaders selected for the current study. The leaders served in the following leadership roles: (1) Vice Provost responsible for strategy development, (2) Applied Social Pedagogy Department Chair, (3) First Vice Provost, (4) Vice Provost for Character Education, (5) Dean, School of Humanities, (6)
Interviews with UCU leaders took place between 03.29.2011 and 04.30.2011. During the semi-structured interviews, I used an interview guide (see Appendix E, parts 1-3). Part One of the semi-structured interviews aimed to understand the UCU leaders’ views on university-based moral and civic formation. Part Two of the semi-structured interviews was focused on understanding how the UCU leaders’ views aligned with UCU organizational mission and practices. The interview guide for this part of the interviews was used with UCU leaders and with members of the non-UCU academic community. Finally, Part Three of the interviews with UCU leaders sought to understand the current state of character education in UCU from the perspective of what is considered to be an effective framework of school-based character education. The third part of the semi-structured interviews utilized a survey instrument titled Eleven Principles Survey of Character Education Effectiveness (DeRoche & Williams, 2001).

The survey, which is well respected in the field and widely used by educators, was originally developed by the Character Education Partnership (CEP), the Washington, DC-based national character education advocacy organization, drawing on the critical work of Tom Lickona, Eric Schaps, and Catherine Lewis (1995). It was initially designed for the K-12 setting; to adapt the survey tool to the UCU setting, the survey questions not applicable to the university setting or to the Ukrainian educational context were removed. Among other services and activities, CEP provides research-based evaluation tools for use by teachers, schools, and communities to assess the quality and effectiveness of character education programs and processes. The survey tool was created in consultation
with the leading U.S. moral and character education researchers, whose work served as the theoretical framework for the current study. The instrument’s validity has been discussed by character education researchers (Bulach, 2000). Bulach (2000) examined the aforementioned Eleven Principles of Effective Character Education survey instrument, initially developed from the work of Lickona, Schaps, and Lewis (1995), for the purposes of adapting it to develop a character instrument that assesses 16 character traits. Bulach (2000) conducted a factor analysis of the instrument, which revealed that there are three factors measured by the instrument: behaviors related to school–community relations, curriculum-related behaviors, and behaviors related to internal, school-based situations. Reliability of the instrument was +.90, as measured by the Cronbach alpha (Bulach, 2000). The reliability of the school community relations factor was +.88, the curriculum factor was +.91, and the internal relations factor was +.93. Bulach (2000) noted that there was little data regarding the construct validity of this instrument. However, it offers an important insight about how practices facilitate or hinder a school’s character education program.

The interviews with four leaders and four students lasted longer than the initially anticipated 45 minutes, because the participants were eager to provide detailed and thoughtful responses. One interview had to be interrupted and continued at a later date because of that leader’s full schedule. Due to the leaders’ limited availability and the 8-hour time difference, the last section of the interview guide (which was also used in student interviews) was completed by the interviewees in writing. At the same time, most of the questions had already been answered either directly or indirectly during the
interviews. In addition, upon transcription, each interview was mailed to the interviewee for member checking. None of the interviewees read the others’ interviews. UCU leaders provided additional internal documents, such as institutional policies and course syllabi, and advised me on additional literature on Catholic Social Teaching, which guides their own philosophy of leadership and university teaching. Conducting semi-structured interviews at the case study level (as opposed to unstructured interviews at the context level) allowed me to provide a consistency that helped later in creating a detailed picture of UCU leaders’ views. It also enabled me to perform a more complex data analysis, treating each leader as a case within the institutional case, creating individual vignettes and a detailed collective picture of UCU leaders’ views on university-based student moral and civic formation. All interviews were audio-recorded using a digital audio recorder or Skype recording software and saved in a password-protected electronic folder.

Unstructured interviews were conducted with four UCU students and non-UCU academic community representatives. The students were 3rd- and 4th-year students. The non-UCU academic community representatives occupied leadership roles in their respective institutions and in the past served on the UCU’s advisory board. Data from these unstructured interviews enriched the emerging understanding of the ways UCU leaders’ three aspects of leadership—philosophical, organizational, and theoretical—unfolded within UCU organizational practices, particularly in the domain of university-based student moral and civic formation.

Data obtained from the artifacts were used to explore the alignment of leaders’ views on university-based student moral and civic formation with organizational mission and
practices. The university’s institutional documents reviewed for this study included institutional policies, sample syllabi of character formation-relevant courses, and the documents on UCU’s history, mission, and vision. The artifacts consisted of publications in Ukrainian- and English-language media about the university leaders’ and faculty’s views on such issues of national importance as systemic corruption, declining democracy, national identity, and Ukraine’s leadership vacuum, and about the university’s organizational activism in addressing these issues. In addition, the university’s website was examined for university governing structure, academic and extracurricular programs, and community engagement within the university and with broader community (Table 5).

Table 5
*Documents Analyzed for the Sphere of UCU Organizational Context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Documents Analyzed for UCU Organizational Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UCU Organizational Policy | • Policy on UCU Educational Process  
                          | • Policy on spiritual, civic, and academic freedom in UCU, (February 2010). Retrieved from http://ucu.edu.ua/about/polozhannya-pro-svobodu-v-uku/  
| UCU Syllabi            | • Christian Spirituality  
                          | • Ethics                                                        |
| UCU Documents         | • UCU Memorandum on Visit to UCU by the Representative of Ukrainian National Security Service Responsible for Church Relations (May 18, 2010). Retrieved from http://ucu.edu.ua/news/2670/  
                          | • UCU’s Letter to the Minister of Education and Science of Ukraine Dmytro Tabachnyk Regarding the Draft of The Law |
Document Type | Documents Analyzed for UCU Organizational Context
---|---

Media Artifacts | • Marynovych Calls Lviv City Administration to Transparency. Retrieved from http://ucu.edu.ua/library/5900/
• M. Marynovich on Ukrainian Catholic University’s contribution to Ukrainian democracy [Recorded webcast from U.S.-Ukraine Foundation]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fsKthGl5t0
During and after each interview, I wrote field notes about my observations of participants’ responses and of any issues that seemed to provide additional insight. I used these field notes as an additional data source (Maxwell, 2013) that could be triangulated with the other data collection methods. Triangulation of data sources ensured data validity and strengthened data analysis. Field notes were treated as a data source, because they provided additional information to the interviews. The field notes were used during the study (a) to document initial reflections, thoughts, and questions for the participants, (b) to indicate follow-up questions for the participants on items that called for further clarification or review of the UCU documents, and (c) to document observations about the interviews that were not captured in the recordings and transcripts.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis process correlated to the three embedded spheres in the study design: (a) the UCU leadership sphere, (b) UCU organizational mission and practices, and (c) educational policy context. I employed the following data analysis methods: analytical memos and field notes, member checking, constant comparative method, categorizing and connecting, and explanation building. To understand the national educational policy context and to examine how participants’ reporting aligned with the current sociopolitical environment in Ukraine, I analyzed national higher education policy data.

I first explored Ukraine’s national higher education and character education policy mechanisms that support the university-based moral and civic formation of undergraduate students. To do so, I first reviewed policy documents and media artifacts
from a variety of Ukrainian news sources and websites of international development organizations working in Ukraine (United Nations Development Program, Open Society Foundation, and others) to understand and describe the broader context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet higher education.

I began by reviewing context-specific national policy documents and media artifacts, and later I included data from transcripts of policy-clarifying interviews. I then analyzed emerging data through analytical memos, analysis of interview transcripts, and review of institutional documents and artifacts. I combined categorizing and connecting strategies in analyzing the policy-relevant documents. I was concerned with the meaning of the policy texts, because they indicated strong emphasis on civic and moral formation of students and character education in the Ukrainian educational system (K–16). The meaning of the national policy texts was important because this was a contextual backdrop against which moral and civic formation were taking place in all Ukrainian universities (including UCU).

I then wrote analytical memos, summarizing the Ukrainian policy context in character education and the post-Soviet developments in Ukraine’s higher education in general. I then followed up with clarification interviews. I made field notes and wrote memos during and after these interviews. Upon completion of the clarifying interviews, I reviewed the notes and memos and extracted additional categories. I wrote memos during examination of national policy documents, during the policy-clarifying interviews, during and after each interview with leaders and students, and during the review of institutional documents and artifacts. During the interviews, I wrote brief reflective memos and field
notes. Upon completion of the interview transcription, I first printed out the transcripts of interviews with UCU leaders and read them in their entirety. During the second reading, I conducted detailed content analysis to identify recurring themes. At the same time, I made field notes and wrote analytical memos.

I wrote memos in the form of reflective notes about what I was learning from the data (see the example in Figure 6). I wrote personal reflections, or notes to myself, on some aspects of interviews that I might want to review or to emphasize during the analysis process, on concepts and their relationships, or on any follow-up questions that came to mind during and after the interviews. Some memos were written during interviews in the form of a new computer file, dated, and correlated with the fields of the interview transcript’s date, in order to catalog my emerging understanding of the policy issues to bring forth specific points that seemed to stand out. Because in qualitative research data analysis begins during data collection, in the current study, memos served as an additional data source as well as a data analysis method. I wrote analytical memos to catalog and create a record (Samaras, 2011) of my emerging understanding of the leaders’ views and my questions and reflections. For example, during policy clarification interviews I made reflective notes, highlighting some aspects that particularly stood out to me. Later, these memos were used as a data source and were coded and analyzed in a similar manner to other data sources.
Following this stage of analysis, I imported the entire data set of leaders’ case interviews into Dedoose, an Internet-based platform for qualitative and mixed methods analysis. Initially known as EthnoNotes (Lieber, Weisner, & Presley, 2003), it has been in existence for about 15 years. It was developed by UCLA researchers Eli Lieber and Thomas Weisner, who later formed a company, SocioCultural Research Consultants, LLC. The platform has gained wide usage and has been recognized in qualitative and mixed methods research circles as another option for technology-assisted data analysis (CAQDAS, n.d.). Appendix F depicts a sample memo page in the Dedoose interface that documents my reflections and early interpretations of the emerging data. Memos in Dedoose can be organized in a custom folder structure depending on a researcher’s need. Memos may be linked to any number of items or not linked in a Dedoose project database. Dedoose memos can also be easily exported for analysis use in preparation of the findings report.
Cataloging of memos was essential to meaning-making and to maintaining transparency of the data analysis process (Samaras, 2011). Cataloging in Dedoose was achieved in the following way. I created a specific folder for filing memos. These analytical memos were created during the initial coding in Dedoose, when applying a constant comparison method. In Dedoose, these were connected to a specific section of the interview texts. At the same time, the same section of the text would have a number of codes applied. This allowed for connecting the memos to the codes and categories. Such ability to view memos in conjunction with the codes and the entire interview text further informed the analysis and ability to synthesize emerging meaning. For example, in Appendix G, in addition to the application of codes, I could see in the top right corner the number of analytical memos for that particular interview. When I selected the memo tab, the memo connected with this interview would open. As I read through the text and reviewed the categories and memos, I was able to establish connections between categories as well as linking the data segments, as further discussed in this chapter. In addition, connecting meaning and concepts between categories was enhanced by the use of Dedoose’s memo catalog. It allowed me to select a particular category from the coding tree, shown in the right part of Appendix G, and then select memos associated with that specific category.

I also used the categorizing and connecting method to look for the relationships among the patterns (Maxwell & Miller, 2008) in both the context-related and case data. During the early stage of analysis, I examined the data from the interview transcripts and documents for relationships and intersections between the parts of these texts. For
example, I looked at how UCU leaders’ Christian and Catholic identity connects with their views and actions. Data was categorized through the use of substantive categories that described and reflected participants’ conceptualization of the issues (Maxwell, 2013). While grouping units into categories and subcategories, I looked for thematic connections and recurring patterns between the categories and connected the categories. Reflective memos and field notes that I took during data collection from documents, as well as interviews, were analyzed in a similar manner. I utilized the Dedoose platform to code and chart content of interviews, grouping emerging data into subcategories and later merging these into broader categories.

To identify the issues and emerging themes in the participants’ responses to the interview questions and in the institutional documents, I established the following initial organizational categories (Maxwell, 2013) to sort the emerging data: views, organizational dimension, and context. The organizational categories were treated as data bins, into which the emerging data would be initially sorted. Drawing on the previous research in the field of character education and the review of the literature, I first created a set of preset categories and entered them into a simple text format (see Appendix B). I then entered these preset categories into the online Dedoose platform I used to analyze the data. These preset categories were used in the later stage of the constant comparative analysis that was conducted at the case level of UCU leadership. These preset theoretical categories were derived from prior research. The preset broad categories included the following three categories: (a) definitions of moral formation and moral education, (b) understanding (by leaders) of developmental appropriateness, and (c) moral and civic
formation of university students. I used coding as categorizing strategy. I first applied one of three codes to the texts of transcribed interviews.

Each of these categories had a number of preset subcategories derived from literature (Appendix B). For example, two of the theoretical categories and codes were (a) moral atmosphere of the school and (b) attachment to a community that models and offers opportunities for direct democratic participation. The latter has several additional subcategories derived from the literature review on the previous empirical research.

- Attachment to community that models and offers opportunities for direct democratic participation
  - Educators create environment that allows students and adults become active participants in a democratically functioning community
  - Educational process that facilitates democratic formation of students:
    - Students make decisions about real life dilemmas and actions, ones they have to make for the school’s survival as a community.
    - Confronted by teachers and peers about discrepancies between their public judgments and reasoning and their actual action
  - Community engagement through service

In the theoretical sphere, I analyzed the UCU case study findings through the lens of existing theories to examine the data on whether UCU leaders’ approach to facilitating moral and civic formation of undergraduate students could relate to other existing bodies of literature and extend theory development on the topic (Yin, 2009) of facilitating moral and civic formation of undergraduate students in Ukraine’s post-Soviet context. Using
etic coding, theoretical categories (Maxwell, 2013) were generated drawing from the three theoretical approaches to character education. These categories were used to analyze views and organizational practices that relate to student moral and civic formation. Using the etic approach, I related the emerging data to the set of initial categories derived from the literature (Appendix B).

Exploring the philosophical aspect of UCU leadership, I intended to answer the study’s four research questions. I sought to learn about UCU leaders’ views of the process of university-based student moral and civic formation; to examine the underlying philosophical framework to include UCU leaders’ values and beliefs, and their understanding of university leaders’ and UCU’s institutional roles in undergraduate students’ moral and civic formation and of the university’s role in broader context of post-Soviet Ukraine. The emic approach is culture-specific, and seeks to uncover the knowledge and interpretations that exist within a culture and are “determined by local custom, meaning and belief” (Ager & Loughry, 2004: para. 12). The emic approach helped me investigate the leaders’ beliefs (Kottak, 2006), how they perceive and categorize the world, their rules for behavior, what has meaning for them, and how they imagine and explain things.

For example, the study participants’ philosophical framework was contextual to their immediate environment and the realities of corruption and erosion of values in Ukrainian society. During the interviews, several participants suggested that I familiarize myself with the key ideas of the Catholic Social Teaching, because this was the philosophical framework that informed their roles and their work in a meaningful way. I,
therefore, reviewed key concepts of the Catholic Social Teaching. I have derived a
number of preset categories that corresponded with the key themes of Catholic Social
Teaching, as illustrated in Appendix H: (1) call to family, community, and participation,
(2) care for God’s creation, (3) faith that does justice, (4) goals of education, (5) life and
dignity of the human person, (6) option for the poor and vulnerable, (7) rights and
responsibilities, solidarity and the common good, (8) dignity of work and the rights of
workers. Some of these categories were later dropped, because they were not supported
by the emerging interview data. These categories were care for God’s creation, option for
the poor and vulnerable, and dignity of work and the rights of workers. The preset
categories were modified to incorporate data that emerged from emic coding and
reflected the UCU leaders’ philosophical framework rooted in Christian theology and
Catholic Social Teaching (Appendix H) and included: (1) community as a formational
factor, (2) faith that does justice, (3) education for social justice, (4) life and dignity of
the human person, (5) rights and responsibilities. The sample output from Dedoose
reflecting the categories can be found in Appendix H.

Finally, I reread and recoded the leaders’ interviews, using a qualitative social
research platform, Dedoose. I employed this technology to expedite the recoding process
and to integrate both emic and etic codes into a composite coding tree to reflect the
complexity of the data emerging from the leader interviews. At this stage, the redundant
subcategories and categories in the composite tree were then merged into a more
cohesive framework. The broader categories were then placed within the preset theme. A
sample output display from Dedoose is included in Appendix I.
To identify substantive connections, I looked for associations between the emerging subcategories and categories in the participants’ responses to each question and compared responses of all participants to each question, one by one. I identified some common factors and variations. For example, all UCU leaders’ responses put at the center of their work and educational philosophy the value and dignity of each human being. In addition, there was a strong emphasis on the category of community as anthropological reality that plays a critical role in moral, civic, and character formation. Furthermore, the theme of a transformational and reforming mission of UCU in Ukrainian society was represented by all respondents. These values, according to the participants, are central to the Christian worldview and Catholic Social Teaching.

In addition, I analyzed the frequencies of each subcategory’s appearance in order to determine the more prevalent themes and to examine these occurrences for possible presence of a broader category. I then examined how the categories combined and folded repeating subcategories and categories.

To reduce the number of categories, I connected them to the preset categories and the key additional categories that emerged during analysis. I collapsed subcategories into broader categories. Gradually, a clearer picture of the main characteristics emerged, and the data allowed me to establish associations between them (Figure 7).
I also utilized matrix of categories (Figure 8) as a categorizing strategy (Maxwell & Miller, 2008) to map out and place emerging data within the categories and examine it for patterns (Yin, 2009). To do this, I exported this information into an Excel format that allowed me to view the same data in the form of a graph (code to the number of leader it applied to), as indicated by the sample in Appendix J. I printed out the full output charts exported from Dedoose with preset and emerging codes (Appendices I and K) and then continued to review these outputs for patterns. As a result of the etic and emic analysis, the matrix of preset and emerging categories was established.
Community as a place and a mechanism of civic formation

| Values life and dignity of every human person | Faith that facilitates personal transformation | Leaders model integrity and behaviors, which uphold human dignity | Educational practices facilitate personal and community reflection |
| Education for social justice through, in, and for community (school, local, and global) | Activities that do justice (individual and institutional) - from reflection to action to reflection | Leaders create values-based institutional processes and policies | Educational practices that create opportunities and facilitate engagement through service |

Figure 8. Matrix of Categories. At UCU formation occurs within the context of the UCU community, with a view to benefitting the larger community of Lviv and Ukraine.

In addition to categorizing, when emerging meaning was based on similar distinctions (Maxwell & Miller, 2008), my application of connecting method was very similar to listening to the voices in the text of interviews described by Maxwell & Miller (2008). The connecting analysis was essential in considering the UCU leadership’s broader context. Narrative and contextual analyses (Merriam, 1998; Maxwell & Miller, 2008) were utilized in analyzing the Ukrainian policy-relevant data. I first read the documents in their entirety and then marked documents with comments that identified areas or policy aspects that highlighted definitions, interpretations, or implementation mechanisms for character education in the Ukrainian educational system. I also marked the aspects that needed further clarification through the interviews. At the same time, I moved from contiguous meaning-making to categorizing thematically looking for similarities and patterns in policy relevant data, then back to identifying contextual
meaning. The final step in the contextual policy analysis was comparative analysis of these contextual bits of new meaning and trajectories (Maxwell & Miller, 2008). I marked the texts of the documents identifying subcategories and grouped them thematically into categories.

The analysis of the national higher educational policies resulted in the emergence of three key common areas of meaning: (a) definition of moral education by national policies, (b) mechanisms for implementation of the educational policy in moral education, and (c) disconnect between national policy and reality at the level of institutional implementation. In addition, the data that emerged from the documents helped develop open-ended interview questions for the sphere of UCU leadership case, particularly questions pertaining to leaders’ views on student moral and civic formation within Ukraine’s broader educational policy context.

Following data collection and analysis in the sphere of national higher educational policy and context, I conducted data collection and analysis in the sphere of UCU leadership case. I read through the texts of each artifact. I then categorized the emerging themes and focused on the core categories, looking for key issues and recurring statements. Data analysis in the sphere of UCU leadership case involved three aspects of UCU leadership: (a) philosophical, (b) institutional, and (c) theoretical (Figure 4). I particularly looked for themes and categories found in the research literature on effective character education discussed in the previous chapter. In addition, I paid specific attention to any philosophical and practical outliers, not found in the character education literature. These characteristics are folded in with other data and are presented in the
research findings. The leaders’ philosophical framework is informed by Christian values and Catholic Social Teaching and is presented in Chapter 4.

In subsequent analysis of interviews, I also listened to the “polyphonic voices” of study participants (Maxwell & Miller, 2008, p. 122) regarding the students’ moral and civic formation and the role of UCU leaders. I was also attuned to the voices pointing out leaders’ modeling behaviors, the role of the school community at UCU, and opportunities for meaningful engagement in service and reflection. The listening depended on research questions. For example, as I pondered the UCU leaders’ views of their own leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation, I listened for the voices of each individual’s journey to leadership and to UCU. I also listened for the ways UCU leaders made meaning of their own personal mission, UCU’s vision and mission, for the programs, services, and projects they as leaders chose to initiate or approve and engage other faculty members and students. In addition, I established connection between the categories and the context, because “qualitative case studies can be highly contextual” (Maxwell & Miller, 2008, p. 114). For example, I explored how the category of community connected to personal and organizational values, philosophical attributes, individual and organizational actions, and why and how it was important to the UCU leaders in the context of contemporary Ukraine. Connection of categories allowed me to rearrange the categories to reflect the meaning the participants made regarding their views and role, as illustrated by the matrix (Figure 8).

I utilized Dedoose platform’s capabilities to create visual displays of emerging themes. I exported the categories by interviewee into an Excel spreadsheet that provided
a visual display of the total number of times each code was applied by each leader and by all leaders (Appendix K). As I read through the text and reviewed the categories and memos, I was able to establish connections between categories and link the data segments, as further discussed in the “connecting” section. In addition, connecting meaning and concepts between categories was enhanced by the use of the Dedoose memo catalog. It allowed me to select a particular category from the coding tree, shown in the right part of Appendix G, and then select memos associated with that specific category.

In addition, to analyze leaders’ viewpoints I created vignettes for each individual leader and made a cross-case synthesis of these vignettes into a detailed picture of the UCU leadership’s views on university-based moral and civic formation. I first analyzed each individual interview of UCU’s seven leaders. Common themes emerged across all interviews, as I read and reread the interview transcripts. At the same time, the data from each leader’s interview had indicated some unique characteristics, whether it was the field of the leader’s study, background, or history of joining UCU. In order to capture the uniqueness of this emerging data, I decided to create short vignettes for each individual leader. I used a creation-of-leader vignette as a type of connecting analysis (Maxwell & Miller, 2008). These vignettes were utilized to connect the textual data from each of the UCU leaders’ interviews to their view of student moral and civic formation, leadership, and UCU institutional role. Vignettes also assisted in connecting the contexts of leaders’ individual life stories to the categories. In a way, in linking emerging meaning to categories, vignettes played a key role in creating a holistic and unified portrayal of UCU leadership in the Findings section.
I conducted member checks (Creswell, 2007) with the participants of both the context-focused and the case interviews during and at the end of the interviews through reflective summaries. Additionally, during the data analysis stage, transcribed interviews were e-mailed to participants for checking and clarification of any new emerging data. The participants’ feedback on the draft analysis may increase the accuracy of the analysis and the construct validity of the study (Yin, 2009). Furthermore, participants’ review of the data analysis created an opportunity to additionally contribute to the data (Yin, 2009). Just two of the leaders e-mailed me back the transcripts with clarifications and minor changes that offered more detail and clarity.

The constant comparison method was also used to analyze the data. Typically, this method is used for theory building. In this study, the constant comparative method was used for the inductive analysis—code development and application, assigning the codes to reflect conceptual relationship (Merriam, 1998), and categorizing and connecting. Data were analyzed on an ongoing basis. When analyzing the interviews with UCU leaders, I applied the following steps in the constant comparison method of analysis (Fram, 2013; Glaser, 1965). First, I read the interview transcripts in their entirety. Next, I reviewed each individual response to the interview questions line by line. This was followed by the review of all responses for units of information (words, concepts) that could be identified as meaningful and similarly described by various participants.

During the analysis of interview data, I first used the preset categories and subcategories derived from literature on previous research. I then broadened the preset categories to include new subcategories that emerged from the interview data. These
were substantive and theoretical categories (Maxwell, 2013). For example, one of the present categories, *attachment to community that models and offers opportunities for direct democratic participation*, included a number of earlier listed subcategories. However, coding of the interview data, using the combination of preset and emerging categories, led to the following list of substantive categories:

- School community that models and offers opportunities for direct democratic participation
  - Relationship with broader society
  - Creating direct democracy
  - Academic freedom
  - Culture of dialogue
  - Culture of service
  - Balanced power dynamics of a truly democratic society
  - Culture of trust
  - Community engagement through service
  - Espoused values
  - Participatory decision-making
  - Culture of collaboration and cooperation
  - Respect for dignity of all
  - Ethical leadership

Descriptive in nature, substantive categories stayed close to the interview data (Maxwell, 2013). I then coded and grouped these units of information into subcategories,
and then grouped the subcategories into core categories. I then focused on the core categories and looked for key issues, recurring statements that later became more general, theoretical categories, as represented in Appendix H. In some instances, theoretical categories were the same (or slightly modified) as preset categories, as in the illustrated example. In other instances, these were theoretical categories that emerged from the interview data. Four such theoretical categories are represented in Appendix H and illustrate theoretical categories that were developed inductively from the data analysis: (a) personal philosophy, (b) relationship between moral and social crisis in contemporary Ukrainian society, (c) Catholic Social Teaching, and (d) character and civic formation role of university leaders.

Continuing with my analysis of the interviews with the seven UCU leaders, I used the purposeful approach to constant comparative analysis (Boeije, 2002). I first compared within a single interview; I followed with comparison between interviews within the same group of UCU leaders; I compared the interviews of all leaders by each question; I then compared the interview data from different groups of leaders—UCU leaders and two non-UCU higher educators; I proceeded to compare the data from interviews with the data from the artifacts, memos, and notes; and, finally, I compared the emerging categories and key themes to how they aligned with the preset categories derived from the literature review. Some of the emerging categories clearly aligned with the preset categories, as described above. However, there were important outliers, which formed new categories and themes. Themes depicted in the graph in Appendix J emerged from the interviews. These themes indicate an emerging association between the historical
influence of a powerful role model in the UCU rector’s life (presented in Appendix L), UCU leaders’ philosophical framework rooted in Catholic Social Teaching, and leaders’ views on the goals of education as a vehicle for moral and civic formation within the context of post-Soviet Ukraine. The CST themes that clearly emerged in this study included (a) community as a formational factor, (b) faith that does justice, (c) education for social justice, (d) life and dignity of the human person, and (e) rights and responsibilities. The sample output from Dedoose reflecting the categories can be found in Appendix H.

Finally, through explanation building, I connected the patterns and relationships within the context and within the case to present a fuller picture. I explored the data for how the participants’ meaning-making made sense within the country’s political and higher education policy context. When intelligible meaning was made by participants, I checked with the context data to see if there was any evidence for establishing a correlation between the categories in case study and context categories.

In addition, the context data has provided the necessary cultural knowledge. It was essential in making sense of the participants’ institutional and social roles, their motivation for leadership, the challenges, and the personal qualities required to persist in this context. The final case study narrative includes an interpretive commentary with a mix of particular description (quotes from people interviewed) and general description (connecting data to the subject as a whole) “to provide a framework for the particular and general descriptions just discussed” (Merriam, 1988, p. 200).
Potential Validity Issues and Limitations

During the processes of designing the study, collecting data, and analyzing the results, I was mindful of validity and reliability as two key factors in assessing the quality of the study (Patton, 2015). Lincoln & Guba (1985) recommended such strategies as negative cases, peer debriefing, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, audit trails, and member checks. They also emphasized the importance of the researcher’s responsiveness, holistic approach, ability to clarify and summarize emerging data, and ability to adapt to possible change in circumstances (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). To help make the research results more valid (Maxwell, 2013), I took the following steps. I described data collection and analysis procedures in detail so that they could be repeated (Yin, 2009). Theories of character education served as the conceptual framework. These theoretical perspectives have informed research questions, study design, data collection, and analysis, and were used to present and interpret the study findings.

To enhance reliability of the study or, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), its dependability, I aimed to create a detailed, step-by-step description of the data collection and analysis process. I examined the process and the results for consistency by examining raw data, data reduction process and outputs, and memos of the analysis process (Campbell, 1996). In addition, I have enlisted the help of critical friends “to gain new perspectives in understanding and reframing the participants’ interpretations” (Samaras, 2011, p. 5). I was mindful of my own bias and reactivity. I used member checking and described data collection and analysis procedures in detail so that they could be repeated (Yin, 2009). I grounded the study in the theories of character education. The study’s
theoretical orientation, rooted in the theories of moral development and character education and discussed in Chapter 3, served as a means to support dependability and validity.

**Addressing Researcher Bias**

My researcher perspective, discussed in Chapter 3, offers an insight into potential biases and the lens of the researcher. My Ukrainian background, Soviet upbringing, personal experiences of post-Soviet transformation and corruption, and Christian worldview and belief in the transformational mission of education are parts of this lens and had to be transparently presented in this study. One of the main assumptions brought to current research was my belief that the ethical values of Christianity and democracy have much in common, and that most of the values found in Christian teachings are also shared by democratic societies.

I used multiple data sources and conducted member checking with study participants. Member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with all study participants took place throughout the interviews by reflective summaries. Additional member checking with the seven UCU leaders took place by e-mail, during the data analysis stage, when transcribed interviews were e-mailed to them for clarification of any new emerging themes. Additionally, I enlisted as critical friends (Samaras, 2011) two trusted PhD program colleagues who are at an advanced stage in their own studies to assist me with validation of the research process and findings.
**Triangulation of Data Sources and Data Analysis Methods**

I used triangulation of multiple and varied data sources and triangulation of methods of analysis. Data was collected from MES policy documents and reports; interview notes; researcher memos; and artifacts such as media accounts, website documents, and video records. To support the validity of the research results, I used triangulation of data analysis methods, as described earlier in this chapter. Data analysis involved context analysis, cross-case synthesis within the leaders’ views sphere of analysis, and cross-unit analysis between two embedded spheres: the leaders’ views and the organizational mission and practices. I also examined how findings support or refute existing theories of character education.

I used triangulation of data analysis methods. Data analysis involved context analysis, categorizing and connecting in describing the UCU leaders’ views, and explanation building in synthesizing the leaders’ views within the context of UCU’s organizational mission and practices. In explanation building, I also examined how findings support or refute existing theories of character education.

**Long-Distance Interviews**

A major limitation for this study was that the interviews were not conducted face-to-face and required use of long-distance telephone service and Internet technology to communicate with the participants. Interviews were conducted via Skype and Skype recording software and via cell phone with the use of a prepaid calling card and handheld digital voice recorder. For this reason, I could not observe participants’ body language and facial expressions, which are important to communication. Video communication via
Skype was usually not reliable, because of technical limitations among Ukraine and United States-Ukraine networks and devices. Based on my previous experience of conducting pilot study interviews with Ukrainian higher educators via Skype and telephone calls, I anticipated poor sound quality for each call and interruptions and challenges in recording the conversations. These issues were addressed in the beginning of interviews by asking the participants to provide alternative telephone numbers and, sometimes, alternative dates to contact them.

**Reactivity**

The long-distance factor also hindered building and maintaining rapport with individuals I had either met briefly or never met before. Because in Ukraine interpersonal relationships are a strong cultural value, I had to make an extra effort to build rapport. To accomplish this, in the beginning of interviews I often shared some of my own experience that I thought participants would relate to, and I also asked additional ice-breaking questions that helped us get to know one another. This proved to be a good strategy, because participants were open and willing to speak of their own background, which was critical in understanding their leadership journey and philosophy. I was careful and aware that too much, as well as too little, rapport might lead to the type of data distortion that occurs when participants are influenced by the information exchange in the rapport; this risk is more likely when interviews are not in person (Seidman, 2006). I also had to pay extra attention to maintaining neutrality, because my own reflexivity (for example, in how I modulated my voice during the telephone conversation) could also
To describe research trustworthiness, the concepts of transferability, credibility, and dependability have been used in qualitative research (Berg & Welander Hansson, 2000; Guba, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2015; Polit & Hungler, 1999). Transferability refers to the extent to which the study findings are applicable to other situations, groups, and settings (Merriam, 1998; Polit & Hungler, 1999). The term is also referred to as generalizability or external validity of the study. Maxwell (2013) makes a distinction between internal and external generalizability. Internal generalizability deals with recognizing similarity of the study findings across the setting or the group examined in a study (Maxwell, 2013), whereas external generalizability refers to transferability of the conclusions. Internal generalizability of the whole case of UCU leadership was achieved by ensuring absence of selectivity in the study design—participant selection, data sources, data analysis—and the types of interactions with the study participants.

The case study design limits transferability of the findings to the case of UCU. However, certain generalizations can be made by “finding ways for practitioners to apply knowledge and to take advantage of the kind of learning that comes from experience, the case study then playing the role of provider of vicarious experience” (Becker, 1990). As pointed out by Stake (1994), each case may be unique; however, this case is also an example within a broader group of Christian (including Catholic) universities and higher
education institutions in the post-Soviet space, and there is a possibility for the transferability of the study conclusions.

Some of the findings and theory-based explanation building may be relevant to and resemble reality in other settings. Although these findings have only been used to describe and explain the case of UCU and how its leadership views of university-based student moral and civic formation inform and impact UCU’s organizational mission and practices, the data can be used by practitioners to inform their engagement with the post-Soviet higher education. In addition, it can be utilized to inform the development of a survey and study that would research character and civic formation in a larger part of the Ukrainian higher education sector, with the possibility of extending the research to the other former Soviet nations.

Selection of Student Participants

One validity threat possible at the organizational level is the process used for selecting student participants. Due to the geographic distance, I asked UCU leaders to refer 3rd–4th year students for participation in this study, rather than seek them out myself; but this process created the potential for the influence of leaders’ subjectivity. I attempted to address this potential threat by first asking the students how they were selected for this study. My concerns were allayed when I learned from all of the students that the number of students first approached by faculty mentors was greater than the number that actually volunteered, and those who chose to participate did so because they felt that their views and experiences would contribute to this study.
Ethical Concerns

At the time of interview scheduling, I explained to the participants the purpose of the study, their role, and the planned protection. I also explained that I would be using a digital recorder to capture the conversation in every detail, because the details were very important. I let them know that I might be taking some notes, although I tried to keep the notes to a minimum.

During scheduling by e-mail, I also provided each participant with information found on the informed consent form (Appendix M). In addition, at the time of interviews, the information in the informed consent form was verbally reviewed. There were several reasons for the use of the verbal format of the informed consent. First, many of the study participants represented an older generation that, based on my pilot study experiences, was not very comfortable with recent information technology-enhanced communication. Second, those individuals who did have an adequate level of computer skill may not have had the technology easily available to them because of the way fees are structured by Internet service providers in Ukraine or may not have had access to scanners. Third, using postal services did not appear a feasible option because of widespread theft and unreliability in the Ukrainian postal system, and the fact that return postage is not available for purchase outside Ukraine. However, I asked each participant, in addition to granting a verbal consent, to e-mail back to me an electronically signed copy of the consent form if possible. Most of the participants did.

The single case study design made it difficult to maintain the anonymity of the case university. Yin (2009) suggests that it is desirable to disclose the identities of the
case and the individuals, unless the case study is related to a controversial issue or the issuance of the report may affect actions of the participants. In either of these situations, anonymity must be protected. However, this study does not fall into either risk category. The individuals interviewed have reputations within the Ukrainian government, the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States and Canada, and leaders in all three nations. Because UCU leaders had many times taken an open stand against the recent trend of democracy repression in Ukraine, they had knowingly exposed themselves to possible retaliation from Ukrainian authorities. All participants expressed their comfort with the potential lack of anonymity, and some even joked about the fact that they and their university had been on the government’s “radar” for a long time. However, UCU leaders have—to a certain extent—used mechanisms of international protection by involving United States and Canadian leaders to put pressure on Ukraine’s government through international diplomacy mechanisms. Thus, this study, as it seeks to explore the views underlying such civic activism, did not pose any risks that could harm the participants.

Nonetheless, I preserved the participants’ confidentiality using a compromised approach (Yin, 2009). This approach involved disclosing the identity of the case study university but withholding names of the individuals and their respective responses by coding the collected data and assigning an identification key to each participant. I, the researcher, was the only person who had access to the identification key.

Each participant was asked for informed consent in order to participate in the study. Informed consent was audio-recorded, and participants were also asked to e-mail the consent form (Appendix M) back to me with an electronic signature, if they had
feasible and affordable access to Internet transmission. All audio-recorded study participation consents, personal information about the participants, and audio-recorded interview data were stored in password-protected electronic files in my own password-protected personal computer, and the password was and is known only to me, the study investigator.

Summary

Presented in this chapter were the research questions and design. This study of UCU leadership used the qualitative case study research method. The single-case study with embedded design was appropriate, because the case of UCU leadership was revelatory (Yin, 2009) of UCU leaders’ beliefs, views explored in the study’s four research questions. The research questions were aligned with three embedded spheres: the sphere of UCU leadership case, the UCU organizational sphere, and the sphere of Ukraine’s national context. Description of the study design and research questions were followed by a discussion of data sources, study setting, participants and their recruitment, the current data collection and analysis procedures, research ethics concerns, and researcher assumptions and bias.

Data was collected from MES policy documents and reports; interview notes; researcher memos; and artifacts such as media accounts, website documents, and video records. Internal validity was achieved by triangulating methods of data analysis. Data analysis involved context analysis, analysis of three aspects of UCU leadership, synthesis of UCU leaders’ views, and connecting analysis between two embedded spheres: the leaders’ views and the organizational mission and practices.
Finally, the chapter concluded with the discussion of issues of validity and the way these were addressed, as well as a reflection on potential limitations of the current methodology. I described data collection and analysis procedures in detail so that they could be repeated (Yin, 2009). Theories of character education served as conceptual framework. These theoretical perspectives have informed research questions, study design, data collection, and analysis, and were used to present and interpret the study findings. I used multiple data sources and conducted member checking with study participants. Member checking with the study participants took place throughout the interviews by reflective summaries, and also by e-mail, during the data analysis states, and when transcribed interviews were e-mailed to participants for member checking and clarification of any new emerging data. I used triangulation of multiple and varied data sources and triangulation of methods of analysis.

The study findings will be discussed in Chapter 4. That chapter provides an overview of the case study university’s leaders’ views on university-based moral and civic formation and unveils key elements of the leaders’ philosophical framework that guides their commitment to integrated student development. It concludes by presenting the findings at the organizational level and describes the ways that the leaders’ views have aligned with institutional policies, academic and outreach programs, and advocacy work. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the findings through the lens of literature on moral development and character education and offers recommendations for further research.
Chapter Four

The purpose of this study was to explore the Ukrainian Catholic University leaders’ views of university-based student moral and civic formation. In addition, it aimed to identify the ways their views informed the university’s organizational mission and practices within the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transition. Situated within the broader context of post-Soviet Ukraine, the study explored the following research questions:

1. How do UCU leaders describe the values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university and how do these values and beliefs align with the university’s policies and practices?

2. How do UCU leaders understand UCU’s institutional role in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

3. How do UCU leaders view their leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation?

4. How do UCU leaders view UCU’s institutional role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduates and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?
The UCU qualitative case study is a single-case study of UCU leadership. The case study had an embedded design, described in Chapter 2. This case study design was aligned with the research questions and included three spheres: the sphere of UCU leadership case, which is situated within the UCU organizational sphere, which in turn is situated within the sphere of Ukraine’s national context (Figure 3). In the inner sphere of the UCU leadership case, the study explored and described UCU leaders’ (a) values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university, (b) views on UCU’s institutional role in the broader context of post-Soviet Ukraine, (c) views on the leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation, and (d) views on the university’s role in moral and civic formation of undergraduate students. In the UCU organizational sphere, the study explored and described the alignment of UCU leaders’ values and views with the university’s mission and practices that facilitate the moral and civic formation of undergraduate students.

The data analysis was an iterative process that began from understanding UCU’s organizational context, followed by understanding the UCU leadership and exploration of the leaders’ views. It then continued on to the deeper understanding of UCU’s organizational nuances, and to the exploration of how the organizational practices are linked with the national context, returning again to a more in-depth understanding of the leaders’ views, and again to an even deeper understanding of their connection to the specific nuances of the organizational and national contexts. The embedded design involved review of the institutional website and media artifacts (UCU leaders’ articles, blog posts, and interviews in Ukrainian print and Internet-based media). In addition to the
The study findings are presented in this chapter. There is no standard format for case study research (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, care was taken to write the narratives so that the emerging data were clear and provided an easily understood description of the case study university’s context, leaders’ views, and organizational practices and policies regarding student moral and civic formation. The presentation of findings includes an overview followed by a detailed description of the findings.

In all of the following quotations in this chapter, italics denote emphasis provided by the interviewees, not by the researcher. The findings are presented as responses to each of the posed research questions. Findings also illustrate specific ways that the UCU leaders’ beliefs and values align with the university’s mission and practices to facilitate the moral and civic formation of undergraduate students. Analysis of interviews conducted with UCU leaders, representatives of the non-UCU academic community, and UCU students and analysis of UCU institutional documents and media artifacts led to the following findings.

**Findings for Research Question One**

Research Question One was “How do UCU leaders describe the values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university and how do these values and beliefs align with the university’s policies and practices?” The following four themes emerged:
1. Christian anthropology plays a key role in shaping UCU leaders’ philosophy of education and leadership.

2. CST values and principles are prominent in UCU leaders’ philosophy of education and leadership.

3. UCU leaders are intentional in applying CST principles in UCU institutional contexts.

4. UCU leaders believe that upholding human dignity through institutional policies promotes integrity and justice.

Analysis of data from interviews with UCU leaders and students, from the university website and documents (descriptions of programs of study and syllabi), and from media artifacts supports the concept that UCU is a faith-based university. It was established on the foundation of Christianity and in particular Roman Catholic tradition. One of the key findings reported was UCU leaders’ values and beliefs, which they described as being informed by CST. Discussed in Chapter 2, CST is a philosophical framework of the Roman Catholic Church that guides that church’s engagement with the world, particularly on the matters of social, economic, and environmental justice.

Christian anthropology plays a key role in shaping UCU leaders’ philosophy of education and leadership. Analysis of UCU leaders’ interview data strongly suggested that at the center of UCU leaders’ philosophical framework was the key Biblical theme, shared by CST, that a human person is created in the image of God. For this reason, UCU leaders believe that the most important philosophical principle is the value of the intrinsic dignity of the human person. This theme was articulated by all UCU leaders. Although
not every leader explicitly stated this CST principle, the belief came through strongly in all interviews through a number of themes supported by all UCU leaders. Examples of these themes include: caring relationships, attachment, belonging; caring relationships within university; culture of trust; emphasis of and strong sense of community; culture of service; academic freedom; and respect for human dignity of all. As one of the UCU leaders described it: “Although we live in [the] real and not an ideal world, nevertheless it is important to have ideals that guide us. One such ideal is dignity, respect for the dignity of a student, his freedom, and his choice” (from interview with Leader 3).

CST values and principles are prominent in UCU leaders’ philosophy of education and leadership. Unexpectedly, UCU leaders evinced no familiarity with Ukraine’s national policies articulating its goals of character and moral formation in universities, described in Chapter 2 of this study. However, this lack of familiarity was not a result of ignorance. Rather, it resulted from UCU leaders’ acute awareness of the existing discrepancy between the policy proclamations and the actual practices in Ukraine’s corrupt educational environment to which the participants referred during the interviews. For example, one of the leaders, who had previously occupied key research and administrative positions in the state system of education and specialized in character education, mentioned that despite many official proclamations, very little had been done in practice. He also indicated that one of the reasons for his joining the UCU administration was the ability to implement UCU’s mission and to establish programs that would build Ukraine. The offer to work at UCU came while he was still in the government position:
I left my position because my convictions differed from the Minister’s, who now runs education in Ukraine. As the head of the regional educational administration, I could not refuse to implement those orders I had believed were not necessary. I could not be “at war” with the Minister . . . and, obviously, had to resign and leave the position, and then . . . I received an offer [from UCU]. . . . We want to build a church, we want to build our Ukraine, to build our city, and to build our community at UCU according to the University’s mission and our beliefs—that’s all (from interview with Leader 4).

Another leader indicated that while he was not familiar with the specific policies, he believed that the government-controlled higher education accreditation and certification system in general and the lack of university autonomy in particular resulted in a corrupt system, which was not capable of educating students as moral, ethical, and responsible citizens. Another leader said that he had made an effort to create educational processes and programs in his academic unit that would allow for holistic and integrative education, as described in government policies, but did it because he was familiar with theories of youth development and not the government policies.

By contrast, the interviewees’ key underlying belief was in their own need for integrity, to be personal agents of transformational education, grounded in Christian values or, more specifically, in CST. All of the UCU leaders described the values and beliefs that guide their leadership and approach to university-based moral and civic formation as informed by CST. Of these, five leaders specifically underscored the value
of the life and dignity of the human person; seven emphasized the importance of community, respect, and solidarity; all seven stressed the transformational role of education; and all emphasized the importance of service and leaders’ intentionally acting as models of service to a broader community. As one leader expressed this manifestation of his Christian philosophy:

My philosophy of leadership is based on Christian principle of service. . . .

More than once I was convinced that . . . members of our university community simply agree to help one another when it is needed, not thinking whether their position and status corresponds with this. . . . I do not care. The crown will not fall off my head, as they say. I take pleasure to serve someone, and this is a part of the UCU community ethics [ethos]. I see this in many people; it is easy and enjoyable to do good for others, because you know that they too easily and with pleasure respond to this (from interview with Leader 6).

These concepts, originating in CST, form the leadership principles that guide the leaders’ approach to university-based education and student moral and civic formation. One of the leaders summarized the aspirations of UCU leaders to educate students who strive for honesty and integrity:

First of all, they must embody responsibility. Their behaviors depend on the level of responsibility, levels of understanding, maturity, and initiative. Unfortunately, there are students who may not tell the truth or may feel like they can manipulate those that easily trust—it happens even here, and
we recognize that we are not saints. What we do, we explain . . . that this
is not the right way, and that one cannot achieve anything on lies. The key
quote of our colleague Myroslav Marynovych is that “we must strive not
for success, but for truth and integrity.” And those who display and model
such truth and integrity, in fact do form [students] (from interview with
Leader 4).

This human-dignity-centered philosophy of leadership embraced by UCU leaders
contrasts with the environment of systemic corruption in Ukraine discussed in detail in
Chapter 2 and which will be further explored in this chapter. The UCU leaders
encouraged the researcher to better understand their views by exploring the CST concepts
located in the online documents of the Catholic Church.

Investigation of the UCU leaders’ philosophical framework led to another
unexpected discovery. The data indicated that, as mentioned, the leaders’ views that
informed their leadership of UCU educational processes were informed predominantly by
CST. Also unexpected was the corollary discovery that the empirical literature on
character education and moral development (this study’s theoretical framework presented
in Chapter 3) did not inform leaders’ views, for none of the UCU leaders made any direct
reference to it—although one of them recognized the importance of university
education’s relevance in addressing the developmental needs of undergraduates.
Nevertheless, the main principles found in CST and in Jesuit pedagogy in particular
(discussed in Chapter 2) have clear parallels with the aforementioned empirical literature.
Furthermore, one of the most important findings, derived from the analysis of interviews, is that UCU leaders are deliberate in their mission to educate students as moral leaders for a democratic Ukraine. As one leader expressed it, part of the problem in Ukraine is not only the decline of state standards, but also the decline of morality. UCU, as a structure of the Catholic Church has an important role to educate students that is grounded in the foundations of the Christian faith, as well as equipped with knowledge in contemporary sciences, computer technologies, and foreign languages. UCU leaders hope to educate students to be morally responsible and morally rooted, in order to build the country on moral values and principles. The leader further reflected on the role of UCU:

At UCU, we see our contribution in creating islands of difference, so that the students we graduate become carriers of those moral values and so that they, for instance, go to work at an IT company or work as a manager of a social program, and they not only declare these moral standards, but also live them—so that others would be drawn to these standards (from interview with Leader 5).

This degree of intentionality was expressed strongly by all UCU leaders. At the same time, however, the scope of intentional involvement in organizational and educational processes was determined by each leader’s institutional role and background. For example, all of the UCU leaders, students, and members of the outside academic community interviewed for this study stressed the key role of the university’s rector in establishing the university, casting the vision for UCU and its mission to the Ukrainian society. Inspired by CST principles, the UCU rector’s vision, personal life of
commitment, and inspiring leadership (discussed in Chapter 2) have led to the creation of a vision-driven community within UCU with a mission to transform Ukraine. For another example, UCU’s vice rector for mission, who was a Soviet prisoner of conscience, plays a key role in bridging the university’s work with the contemporary challenges of Ukrainian society through establishing dialogic links with Ukrainian society.

Analysis of media artifacts (blog entries, public presentations, lectures, syllabi, and reports on policy advocacy work), which took place after all interviews were completed, yielded a strong connection between UCU’s mission, educational work, and the deliberate engagement of its leadership with the broader Ukrainian society. Finally, analysis of the interviews with the students and the UCU academic leaders at the school and the department levels indicated a similarly intentional approach to creating developmentally appropriate curricular and co-curricular integration: learning that is taking place inside and outside the classroom and has involved moral examples of UCU faculty and staff, offered opportunities for service and engagement in the community, and offered positive learning opportunities through students’ experience of the institutional culture and climate (discussed later in this section).

Interviewees uniformly said that, through institutional policies and practices, UCU has supported the students’ and staff’s moral feeling and formation of moral values. Interviewees also uniformly said that UCU policies have promoted an environment quite in contrast to the surrounding society, emphasizing a caring community, academic rigor, community service, and personal and institutional integrity. As one of the students reflected on the university admissions experience, she stressed the alignment of the stated
principles with actual practice, contrary to her awareness of peers’ experiences in other Ukrainian universities:

In Ukraine there is a big divide between formal and practical levels, meaning that in Ukraine I know that there is a very good constitution—it’s written pretty well and theoretically everything is wonderful and should be taking place—however, the practice is contrary. [At UCU], I can say that theory and practice correlate. . . .

When I was applying to the university I did so not because I wanted [a certain major] but because I wanted to study in this university (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

All interviewees believed that UCU has an ethical institutional culture and moral climate. According to all four students interviewed, most students entering UCU are aware of the fact that in UCU what is said is matched by what is done. According to all students and leaders interviewed, integrity, fairness, and justice are very important elements of UCU’s ethos and they are supported by the university policies directing student life and academic affairs. The UCU rector gave a good example of the institutional effort to create a corruption-free environment through organizational policies that are consistently enforced, contrasting UCU’s dynamics of honesty and fairness with the widespread cheating and corruption found in most of Ukraine’s institutes of higher education (discussed in Chapter 2).

According to all UCU students and leaders interviewed, these policies are strictly enforced. For example, bribing is not tolerated in UCU. However, because of their understanding of the difficulties with enforcing a set of ethical behaviors not commonly
practiced within the realities of Ukraine’s systemic corruption (Chapter 2), UCU leadership developed a policy in which the university will expel or fire an individual only upon the second violation. This policy has been enforced more than once; faculty members soliciting bribes have been dismissed. Further, to promote the development of moral reasoning and ethical behaviors, UCU leaders developed policies on student life and conduct that set high standards for academic and co-curricular engagement, including clear academic integrity policies. For example, cheating and plagiarism are discouraged in UCU. Students violating this policy for the first time receive a warning; with the second offense, a student may be expelled from UCU. This policy has also been enforced more than once, and students caught cheating and plagiarizing have been expelled. These policies have served as a framework that has enabled UCU leadership to create within the university a moral climate that promotes ethical behaviors and moral reasoning.

**Summary of Findings for Research Question One**

As mentioned, Catholic Social Teaching has inspired UCU leaders’ views on student moral and civic formation and their leadership philosophy and practice. The theological concept of the human person as created in the image of God and the resulting high value and dignity of a human person have been key, fundamental elements of UCU leaders’ philosophy and practice of educational leadership. For UCU leaders, added to this theological cornerstone were the CST concepts of the high value of community, solidarity, and service. In addition, UCU leaders have taken an intentional approach to educating students as moral leaders for a democratic Ukraine. However, the scope of UCU leaders’ intentional involvement in organizational and educational processes
depended on their role within UCU as well as on their personal background. Finally, Ukraine’s national policies on character and moral education did not appear to play a major role in the ways UCU leaders approach moral and character education. Instead, these policies served as a contextual backdrop for UCU’s educational practices and advocacy work in Ukraine’s higher education policy arena.

Findings for Research Question Two

Research Question Two was “How do UCU leaders understand UCU’s institutional role in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?” Four themes emerged as a result of data analysis:

- UCU leaders believe that UCU’s mission in Ukrainian society is to be an agent of social transformation by educating a new type of Ukrainian citizenry, who are moral persons and active in the country’s young democracy.
- UCU leaders believe that Ukrainian universities have a critical nation-building role aimed at ending corruption, distrust, and lack of solidarity and transforming Ukraine into a true democracy.
- UCU leaders believe that the education of moral persons is an answer to Ukraine’s challenges.
- UCU leaders’ beliefs result in actions that aim to promote moral formation by creating an institutional culture and moral climate that support moral development.

UCU leaders’ understanding of education as a holistic and integrated process of forming a new type of Ukrainian citizenry, who are moral persons and active citizens,
undergirds their belief that UCU’s mission is to be an agent of social transformation. This finding’s themes form a problem–solution pattern. First, UCU leaders believe that Ukraine’s greatest need for social transformation is its lack of moral reasoning and the resulting corruption and lack of trust and solidarity, which prevent the development of true democracy. Second, UCU leaders believe the solution for these ills is transformational education that leads to education of students as persons of moral character. Third, UCU leaders believe that UCU’s specific mission is to educate students to be a new generation of Ukrainian citizens, who are not only moral persons guided by ethical principles but also active citizens. UCU leaders aim to prepare UCU graduates to lead the nation to its democratic future through their engagement in a variety of different spheres of Ukrainian society. These three subthemes are elucidated next.

UCU leaders believe that the lack of moral reasoning and the resulting distrust and corruption in Ukraine are obstacles to democracy and nation building. As mentioned in Chapter 1, corruption is severe and widespread in Ukraine, and interviews with all UCU leaders indicated their belief that the greatest need for social transformation is to reduce this corruption. The interview data indicates that UCU leaders view a direct inverse relationship between corruption and the value and dignity afforded each human being because corruption in its many shapes and forms violates the dignity and erodes the value of a human being. Six out of seven UCU leaders clearly stated this relationship, while one leader focused on the importance of developmentally appropriate formation, pointing at the absence of moral leadership and role models among Ukraine's national leadership in parliament, president, and local governments.
In the words of one UCU leader, “corruption . . . [distorts] human, professional, and power relations, and it makes money a main motivational factor and not honesty and integrity, truthfulness. . . . It distorts relationships” (from interview with Leader 6). UCU leaders view the lack of moral reasoning in Ukraine as the root cause of both corruption and Ukrainian society’s other greatest ill: the lack of trust and solidarity. Also, corruption and distrust mutually reinforce one another. Consequently, UCU leaders believe that an increase of morality and moral reasoning and the resulting reduction of corruption and increase in mutual trust and solidarity are necessary for Ukrainians to be able to develop democracy and build a healthy nation.

UCU leaders unanimously consider corruption to be one of the major societal problems in Ukraine, yet they believe that its development is an inevitable result of its moral and spiritual origins. One of the leaders reflected that current Ukrainian society misunderstands freedom as freedom from law, or lawlessness, and Ukrainians demonstrate “an inability to be controlled by internal boundaries.” This is why, he said, Ukraine “has a wrong orientation as part of its national identity.” He reflected that this wrong orientation was an unavoidable stage in the country’s democratic formation, a stage between freedom from the authoritarian Communist Party and true democracy. He pointed to the need for the nation’s moral leaders to organize in an effort to transform the country and change the direction of the current conversation. This “time must pass,” he said, “and society must want to become civil, moral, highly spiritual” (from interview with Leader 5).
Ukrainian university students experience corruption and lack of moral reasoning in the country. Interviews conducted in this study with the four students not only confirmed the issue of corruption in Ukraine but clarified the specific type of corruption found in most Ukrainian higher education, the context within which UCU operates. In addition, they gave a valuable students’ perspective to the urgency that UCU leaders see in responding to this societal problem with developmentally appropriate and socially responsive means. For example, when the 4th-year student I interviewed was asked by her peers at other Lviv higher educational institutions how much, in bribes, she paid for each end-of-the-semester final exam session, she observed surprise and disbelief on their faces when she responded that she paid no bribes and that, in fact, faculty would get fired for such an incident. She described her peers’ opposite experiences in several HEIs:

The number of bribes per exam session is about ten. . . . Even in [National Ivan Franko University], according to my good friend, there are particular subjects, like physical education—students never even enter that building [i.e., never attend a class]—that have a set schedule of tariffs. At first, it was 50 hryvnias, then 100 hryvnias, and now 150 hryvnias.¹ This means that during the years of study when physical education was still required, the first through third year of study, students would each give 150 hryvnias to the student group leader [starosta], and the

¹ At the time, 100 hryvnias equaled approximately US $8.50. To clarify the cost, note that a school teacher’s monthly retirement pension might typically equal US $125.00.
group leader would take the money to the teacher (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

One pertinent element of the anecdote is the formalized nature of the corruption. Rather than occurring at random or in secret, it is carried out openly with its own standard operating procedures. The anecdote, whose substance is confirmed by other sources (Kvit, 2013; Osipian, 2008b), serves to illustrate the pervasiveness of corruption in Ukraine.

Furthermore, four out of seven UCU leaders clearly indicated that the underlying issue of widespread corruption is the lack of moral reasoning and moral sensitivity, which manifests in lack of trust. At the same time, six leaders pointed to the high levels of trust in the UCU community, which contrasted with the distrust in Ukrainian society. The absence of trust in society, in turn, prevents people from rising and cooperating with each other to bring about positive change:

Today for Ukraine it means not only to have moral leaders—because there are people in many towns and villages, who do not want to follow the ways of evil. . . . There are a lot of people like this, but their problem is that they have not joined hands. The fact that they can create a positive resonance in society is very important. . . . If only these people were not afraid and joined the conversation, voiced out in unison their position (from interview with Leader 6).

Also, UCU leaders observed that in Ukraine the high level of distrust has resulted in extreme injustice. UCU leaders explained that the reason for the existence of distrust is
that the “golden rule [the Biblical principle to love others as oneself] is not operating in
Ukrainian society” (from interview with Leader 6). This principle supposes that if a
person seeks to loves one’s neighbor as oneself, neighbors can trust one another and rely
on each other in difficult circumstances.

Everything comes down to this: . . . indeed, because of lack of trust for
one another, we conclude that the principle of loving one another is not
working or working very poorly. This principle supposes that I love my
neighbor and I trust him or her and can rely on him or her in difficult
times. Thus, human solidarity is founded or constructed on this principle.

. . . The rule of law also is not working because of this. And this has also a
moral basis. . . . [The rule of law in Ukraine] is not working properly
because of corruption, because of the telephone right, because of amoral
judges, who suppose it to be moral to work as a judge and not judge
according to justice, but according to points of view—and this has led to a
situation in which there is no arbitrage and society never ends up facing
[or] confronting itself, when there is no institute to turn to with a call for
justice. . . . Judges, in fact, are ordered through political influences to
render certain decisions. . . . (from interview with Leader 6).

Distrust in society also causes the rule of law not to work. This also, as a result,
inhibits Ukrainian society’s capacity for justice. “Such circumstances . . . traumatize
society . . . and devalue the meaning of justice” (from interview with Leader 6). This lack
of trust and solidarity in society poses a tremendous problem for the development of democracy in Ukraine, because there is a direct connection between trust and solidarity and the ability to form a vibrant and active civil society. As a result, according to one of the leaders, the moral vacuum and lack of trust in Ukraine have led to a fragmented and weak civil society.

Moreover, UCU leaders believe that lack of moral reasoning and trust also results in an absence of standards for guiding Ukraine’s civil society. One of the leaders reflected that such a regulatory foundation for Ukraine’s young civic society cannot be built by the state, but instead should derive its principles, identity, and mission from Ukraine’s Christian tradition carried on by individuals:

A system that exists . . . is . . . hierarchical; unfortunately, in Ukraine there is no civil society. We can speak about certain elements or fragments of civil society; however, the level of standards, the level of societal organization, relationships among people, relationship between the state and what we call civil society . . . The problem is that these standards—which we do not have—have not been built systemically, at the level of appropriate state structures and the elements of civil society. . . . This regulatory role should be played by the moral essence, moral imperatives, moral values, which have been established by the Christian tradition in Ukraine. . . . These elements of moral imperatives could be substituted for the current system of interrelationships, and the level of societal organization could . . . be based on . . . the moral standards that have been voluntarily adopted by the members of society, as well as the state (from interview with Leader 5).
The lack of trust in society has contributed to the weakness of civil society and to the lack
of motivation and solidarity to effect change and keep the authorities accountable.

The lack of trust and solidarity means that government abuse of power cannot be
successfully resisted because there are no social groupings strong, united, and cohesive
enough to do so. As one leader expressed it, “every successful state always has societal
environments . . . which—while depending on human solidarity—are capable of
becoming a social force, which holds the [government authorities] from ruining them
[and the society]” (from interview with Leader 6).

The leaders were in agreement that the lack of moral reasoning meant that the
veneration of money dominated Ukraine. They observed that this attitude was not
balanced by appropriate moral qualities or a principle-driven worldview. This emphasis
on money and the lack of moral reasoning combine to form a belief that “good guys
finish last,” which is an outcome that people reject in favor of trying to finish first
through corrupt practices:

The majority of today’s Ukrainian population believes that while living according
to moral laws, God’s laws, means to be a leader, it also means to lose, to not
achieve success, and therefore the population renounces these moral principles
because [these principles] do not benefit them personally (from interview with
Leader 6).

In Ukraine “an amoral majority rules” (from interview with Leader 6) and those living
with integrity cannot advance professionally or economically. The crisis of moral trust in
Ukrainian society affects all areas of society, and this leader expressed a sense of urgency to reverse this development.

As a solution to all the aforementioned corruption, distrust, and lack of solidarity, UCU leaders uniformly believe that Ukrainian universities have a critical nation-building role in transforming Ukraine into a true democracy. This belief in the potential of higher education to change Ukrainian society has some credibility, considering the fact that 75 to 80% of Ukrainian high school graduates attend colleges and universities (from interview with Leader 3). During the interviews, UCU leaders underscored the potential of higher education institutions for national transformation. Four out of seven leaders suggested that universities can become a place of dialogue between the spheres of Ukrainian society, a place where business, government, and the academy can communicate with each other, instead of existing only for themselves (from interview with Leader 5). However, all seven UCU leaders indicated that the universities’ potential power to help nation-building is not tapped. The systemic corruption exhibited in Ukrainian society and in its higher education practices (discussed earlier in Chapter 2) usually prevent such dialog and inhibit this potential nation-building practice. Although the Ukrainian government established policies to address moral decline through character and civic education in public schools and higher education institutions, UCU leaders were skeptical about the success of these efforts, because many proclamations had historically been made by the country’s authorities but no one followed through.

UCU leaders observed during the interviews that typical university experiences in Ukraine do not form but *deform* student character. Four out of seven leaders explicitly
stated that Ukrainian universities are places where students learn how to engage in corruption, contrary to government policies. However, data from interviews with UCU leaders reflected that all of them have concerns that today’s students are educated by the nation’s corrupt systems through circumstances, namely the reinforcement and modeling of unethical behaviors by the current system. As one leader expressed it:

The human being . . . is part of an educational process that takes place regardless [of Ministry pronouncements]. . . . Life circumstances, daily contacts, relationships with others certainly have an impact on a young person, who is not yet mature; and thus such things as corruption, I believe, definitely educate for character—in a negative sense, understandably (from interview with Leader 3).

Such education in the corrupt system makes government policy statements irrelevant and unenforceable. Moreover, the lasting effects on a person obtaining such education in corruption are deforming:

No words or arguments play any role, since if you know your way around and understand the mechanics of the corrupt system and have been able to somehow adapt to it, that means you have actually received a “good education.” Thus it is a real problem that exists in universities and young people leave universities to a great extent disabled and deformed, with great distrust for people and society in general (from interview with Leader 3).

This understanding of the underlying causes of the problems in contemporary Ukrainian society, including the higher education system—the crisis of values and lack of solidarity and trust, resulting in systemic corruption and the absence of a vibrant, principle-driven
civil society—have informed and challenged UCU leaders to provide an appropriate response to these social challenges.

The data suggests that part of UCU leaders’ appropriate response is to take an intentional approach to leading educational and institutional processes in UCU. The data indicates UCU leaders believe that the education of moral persons is an answer to Ukraine’s challenges because such education creates citizens who will create just laws and follow them willingly. Taking into account the need for transformational change in Ukrainian society, UCU leaders have embraced the education of moral leaders and change agents as their personal and institutional mission, because they believe that when such persons are actively engaged in Ukrainian society, including policy making, they will contribute to solving its problems. One leader explained why it was impossible to address the moral core of Ukraine’s societal problems without focusing on educating and forming human beings rather than merely passing better laws:

If [instead] we focus on forming the [moral] human beings who will create the laws, then we will be educating a person . . . who will [also] then follow these laws, and not because something is forbidden or permissible, but because this human being considers it to be right . . . [and] just toward others (from interview with Leader 2).

All of the leaders interviewed believe that education for moral character and engaged citizenship starts with leaders’ own examples. The leaders emphasized the connection between the educational outcomes in students’ civic learning and civic engagement and university leaders’ personal example and actions. Leaders’ own actions
reflect this connection between their moral values and civic positions. Education by personal example allows UCU leaders “to unite civic engagement with teaching and learning” (from interview with Leader 4). In addition, UCU leaders are certain that leading by positive example is a critical element of education, especially in a society that has very few good examples. This belief in the importance of example is also informed by UCU leaders’ value of the dignity of the human person. According to all students interviewed, UCU leaders’ actions serve as an example for students because they seek to constantly model deep respect and value of others—faculty, staff, or students, as well as members of the external community. Consequently, UCU leaders have sought to develop a new national philosophy and policy framework for the reform of Ukraine’s HEIs. In pursuit of this goal, UCU leaders have initiated a national dialogue on university autonomy and academic ethics with Ukraine leaders of the higher education community. They intend for UCU to be an example of an ethical and corruption-free HEI.

All UCU leaders said that they aimed to educate a new type of Ukrainian citizen—a moral type—that will be part of positive change in Ukraine. The study data suggests that UCU leaders’ belief that the education of moral persons, who will practice as well as otherwise know justice, will promote justice in society. For UCU leaders, there is an undeniable relationship between the moral and societal crises in contemporary Ukraine. They view moral education as a process that is concerned with teaching justice. They aspire to educate students as moral persons who will not only know what justice is, but who will also practice justice by modeling it in their own lives and promoting it in Ukrainian society. More specifically, education at UCU aims to recover a belief in human
dignity, educate UCU community members about their potential and responsibility for justice-oriented change agency, and empower students and faculty to become conduits of justice and agents of change.

Toward this end, UCU leaders believe that creating a critical mass of “moral elite” for Ukrainian society is UCU’s mission. According to UCU leaders, the university’s task is to educate young people, who will form this new kind of elite of Ukrainian society. These elite will be people concerned with the well-being of the nation and who become true public servants of the highest moral and ethical caliber. This type of elite, one leader said, is “not the ‘elite’ that separates itself from society in its narrow, small, private circle, in which [the concept of the] common good does not exist.” Instead they are “people who would serve the societal good—in other words, persons that will . . . be discovering the existence of a common world shared with other neighbors” (from interview with Leader 1).

UCU leaders strive to educate students to become persons of integrity and, in the words of one of the study participants, become persons leading a “principled life” and holding an active civic position (from interview with Leader 2). UCU leaders believe that a moral elite is needed because of the direct causal link between the increase of moral persons and the nation’s capacity to become corruption-free and democratic. For UCU leaders, moral character and active citizenship are inseparable. UCU leaders define a moral person as a principled person, someone guided by principles and not circumstances or self-serving motivations. He or she is someone who has ethical principles, values human dignity, and displays high personal integrity. As one leader pointed out, “In our
context, a moral person is the person who is guided by virtues” (from interview with Leader 4).

According to the rector, UCU’s goal is to prepare students to live lives that bear witness to certain values and virtues, uphold the dignity of others, and possess the following three characteristics:

- A sense of connection with God and who He is;
- A sense of what the world is; and
- A sense of their mission and place in this world.

UCU leaders’ beliefs result in actions that intend to promote moral formation by creating a moral climate that supports moral feeling. UCU’s institutional values, culture, policies, and practices and its distinctive transformational mission are important elements of the university’s moral climate. The overview of the study’s theoretical framework in Chapter 3 discussed the role of a school’s moral climate in students’ moral and civic formation. As revealed by previous research, a more unanimous perception of a school’s moral climate positively correlates with prosocial behaviors (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Brugman et al., 2003; Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez, 2005). An institution can foster the development of moral character by creating a moral climate that supports moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action (Figure 2). Moral feeling involves conscience, self-esteem, empathy, loving the good, self-control, and humility (Lickona, 1991). In this section, I will examine the ways UCU creates a moral climate that supports moral feeling.
UCU leaders believe that the school’s climate has a transforming capacity and that a relationship exists between an atmosphere of care and trust in the school’s climate and students’ formation. One of the leaders described how students’ encounters with this positive climate effects personal change:

If you need . . . even such small things as photocopying something, you can come and . . . ask for help. You can turn to people and anybody will help you, everybody will support you. If they cannot help then they will advise you. And all of this it seems to me educates students. They come to us with different upbringings, different habits, with different behaviors, and you see how with time they change (from interview with Leader 3).

The principle of valuing human dignity is applied in institutional policies and practices. As a result, students experience authentic care and concern from UCU faculty and staff, as well as a corruption-free environment. As a result, students reported that their experiences of a positive moral climate at UCU had a positive impact on their development. One student reflected, “It seems to me that character is formed under the influence of the environment by which we are surrounded. . . . I know everything impacted and influenced me. . . . It builds me up” (from interview with a 3rd-year female student).

The study findings indicate that UCU does have a positive institutional moral climate. UCU faculty and students have described UCU’s moral climate as distinctly positive. New faculty members joining UCU have indicated to UCU leaders that they “see a different relationship among people [in UCU] and that [they feel] it in the
atmosphere and in the attitudes” (from interview with Leader 7). This environment seems to be focused on the empowerment and dignity of all members of UCU’s community, whether students, staff, or faculty.

In the interviews, the leaders and the students emphasized that the environment they experienced in UCU contrasted with overwhelming corruption in the country and in its higher education. As previously noted, UCU students regularly interact with their peers attending public universities, and during the interviews they described the “normal” bribing experiences of their peers. In contrast, students’ examples of their UCU experiences included their encounters with the complete absence of corruption and bribery. Students and leaders underscored that, in the attempt to prevent bribery and corruption in UCU, the university has developed policies and mechanisms to articulate institutional ethical standards. In addition, steps have been made to enforce these policies.

Data from interviews, documents, and artifacts strongly suggested that UCU leaders as well as students consistently view themselves in the broader national context. The 4th-year female student shared that at UCU she experienced a university environment with European standards in its concern about students and in the attitudes of faculty members, saying that students feel that they are treated “as a human being and . . . as a person.”

Students applying to UCU know that UCU differs from other Ukrainian universities in its ethical standards. Before they arrive on campus, students are aware that UCU hopes to create a corruption-free environment and that the school upholds personal and institutional ethics and excellence. According to the views of students interviewed
for this study, the result is an emphasis on rigorous learning. Study at UCU is demanding and requires discipline, commitment, and hard work. For example, mastery of five to six languages is the norm for students. There is a deep understanding among students of the institutional value that it is important to study and learn. A student must work hard in order to succeed, be consistent in study habits, and have academic integrity. These are very important not only from an institutional policy perspective but also, most importantly, because the value of human dignity is at the center of UCU’s identity.

Everybody in my group studies, and I simply, cannot be lazy because I will be ashamed and embarrassed. Students are students and they sometimes attempt to cheat. However, plagiarism is dealt with very strictly. We are warned and then secondly warned and then expelled. This facilitates honesty and quality, and after [being caught] sometimes you even feel ashamed and you won’t even have such a thought in your mind to do something like this (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

Students, from their first days at the university, learn through conversations with older peers that plagiarism is not acceptable at UCU and that they cannot simply copy a paper from the Internet (from interview with a 3rd-year female student). Instead, from the beginning of their studies, students learn how to conduct research with integrity and without plagiarizing. These expectations along with fair and transparent assessment of students’ work lead to acceptance by students of such values as honesty, justice, and integrity and to their respective behavioral outcomes.
We know that we must go to the library, sit with the books, and take the time, so that by the third year of studies this becomes a normal expectation, that you have to work on your own and that you have to write by yourself and that such a thing as plagiarism is not going to cut it here. So it seems to me that this develops some level of honesty and justice. . . . In general, in our university, assessment is very fair. [If you study] then you get a grade of good quality, and if you don’t study you have a worse grade, and this is just (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The practice of academic integrity and intolerance of corruption positively impacts students’ moral formation. According to students, UCU’s policies on plagiarism, corruption, and emphasis of academic excellence promote the development of new, countercultural behavioral habits. Practice of these new behaviors over the course of the four years of study not only makes an impact on individual students but also becomes a deeply ingrained characteristic of the institutional cultural wisdom, passed down from an older student generation to the younger.

UCU’s institutional expectations and standards result in students’ motivation to actively engage in in co-curricular activities as well as academic studies:

You must study and because of that if you do not have internal determination and you do not study, then you will be kicked out—if not in a year, then in two. . . . However, this motivation is not only for the academic elements but also for the extracurricular life that we have in University (from interview with a 4th-year student).
The moral climate includes an atmosphere of care and kindness. UCU students reported an atmosphere of care in the university. Some of the examples they shared may seem ordinary and reflect institutional policy norms elsewhere in Europe or the United States; however, in Ukraine these are still rare cases. One such example is the availability of accommodations for people with disabilities, which enabled the students to realize that at UCU students matter and they are cared about simply because they are human beings.

Care and kindness tend to be expressed by all staff. Students observed that kindness permeates everything at UCU and that openness, simplicity, and authenticity were found even in relationships between faculty and staff. One of the students described that her experience with nonfaculty staff contributed to an atmosphere of care and kindness from her first arrival at the school. From their first minutes at UCU, she said, students would get a warm welcome from a guard: “She turns to you and from the very first steps you feel that you are noticed . . . somebody says good morning and sometimes asks you what happened to make you late.” Similarly, cafeteria workers or shuttle drivers display warmth and kindness: “They will start a conversation with you and this strengthens you and empowers and supports you, and you understand that you belong to a community” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The physical environment also contributes to the positive moral climate. Interestingly, the physical environment also contributes to the school’s moral climate (Tableman, 2004). Future students’ first personal encounter with UCU’s atmosphere usually takes place during the admissions season, when students and their parents enter the university grounds to submit their application for admission. The first impressions,
apparently, are sometimes surprising and lasting, because students would not typically expect the level of care found in the physical plant itself:

I really liked the physical environment. There were wooden desks, polished and beautiful, without markings. . . . Maybe it will sound funny, but the bathroom [impressed me], because in my school I had awful bathrooms and in the [other] university [I considered] bathrooms were also awful, but [at UCU] we found that everything was wonderful from the sanitary standpoint (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The moral climate includes an atmosphere of respect. UCU faculty try to create an atmosphere of respect and students report feeling respected. UCU students who participated in this study, especially those who had graduated, expressed an appreciation for the relations between faculty and students at UCU, which they considered more humane and respectful than at other universities. As UCU leaders reflected, UCU faculty members and leaders are very involved in work with students and treat them with respect. UCU leaders have been trying to build this principle into the fabric of UCU. Students mentioned in particular the presence of deep mutual respect between students and faculty members. Faculty members are polite in communicating with students and express authentic care and concern for students’ well-being and success.

It is in the midst of daily routines, in the ordinary and mundane, that students reported that they had experienced the high levels of respect by UCU faculty members and employees. Students said they truly encountered the atmosphere of respect and care everywhere on campus and emphasized that it played an important role in their
formation. For example, in the cafeteria, faculty members stand in the same line with students, unlike in other schools, and use this opportunity to talk to students, while students “have an opportunity to ask the faculty [questions] . . . so this is a normal healthy atmosphere. In a sense, such democracy is everywhere here. And this forms us, it seems to me” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The moral climate includes an atmosphere of trust. UCU students experience an atmosphere of trust and are motivated to do their best in their academic and co-curricular learning. Students’ experiences ranged from freely leaving laptop computers in a classroom and not being concerned that they would be stolen to experiencing deep respect shown by UCU faculty and leaders—experiences that, compared to other schools in Ukraine, are unprecedented. Trust and care are intentionally developed in UCU and are a part of the institutional ethos. UCU leaders foster the atmosphere of trust because they believe in the importance of trust in creating an organizational climate that upholds human dignity:

[UCU leaders believe in] the importance of respect for others—despite their age, gender, et cetera. We are trying to build in the university [an environment] in which everyone feels welcomed and . . . respected, and . . . loved—if to think in Christian categories, as God loves everyone and . . . [this] is a certain model for relationships (from interview with Leader 5).

The atmosphere of mutual trust translates into students’ commitment to academic excellence. As they experience trust from UCU leaders and faculty members, UCU students develop autonomy in their judgment and an internal motivation to live up to the
higher expectations and standards. At the same time, students observed a contrast between their own level of autonomy developed within UCU’s atmosphere of trust and the lack of trust displayed by some part-time faculty members who have not yet been accustomed to such high levels of student maturity and autonomy:

[They] very often are surprised that a student may allow himself or herself to leave a classroom [during the class]. This is a common practice here [in UCU], if a student truly has a valid reason to leave—because . . . the student doesn’t want to interrupt a lecture. . . . In this university, there is an understanding that if a student came here to study voluntarily and consciously, they understand and realize when they truly need to sit in class and when they may need to leave (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

Examples of students’ experience of UCU’s atmosphere of care and trust indicate that the caring and trusting community plays a key role in students’ moral, ethical, and civic formation. Data from student interviews indicate that students, encouraged by faculty and staff to explore and to embrace learning in a safe and caring environment, develop greater autonomy and an increased sense of freedom in their decision-making. A 4th-year student mentioned that during a meeting with the financial director, the director advised her to learn better to thank people: “It was not part of his responsibility to teach me . . . in a formal way; simply he was thinking about me and my interest and gave me an honest life-based advice.”

The moral climate is supported by the ways UCU leaders make it a priority to authentically invest in students’ lives. UCU is a relatively small community, with
approximately 150 faculty members and 600 students. UCU leaders invest in the quality of their interactions with students and make it a priority to truly invest in students’ lives, get to know them and their aspirations, and interact with them through formal and informal community-building activities. The rector reflected on his and his colleagues’ approach:

One principle is quality and not quantity. And this concerns academic life as well as formation of the culture of the institution outside the academic ethos. And we see that this bears fruit in the students who live and study here for four or five years: they become more open, free, and they operate in this spirit of gratitude, joy, and service.

A 4th-year student reflected on her first experience at UCU, which was during the admissions visit. The rector’s address invited students to consider becoming members of the UCU community by considering their personal contributions, and he reflected on the intrinsic benefits of studying at UCU. She was moved and challenged by the way the rector spoke about thinking and spiritual nuances in an informal way, as a friend and mentor:

He . . . said, “We want to not only give you something but we want you to think about what you can give back to the university.” So I began thinking about it and asked myself whether I deserved to study in such a university, if I had such an inner disposition, such potential and what I might give to this university in return. What it gives me is this learning and spiritual guidance (from interview with a 4th-year female student).
UCU’s rector intentionally integrates into his schedule time to spend with students and colleagues. He and other faculty members invite students into their homes, and, as the rector stated, “When you are a small community, it is natural . . . that almost every student has been to my home and to other lecturers’ homes.” The rector intentionally does not teach too many courses, so that he has an opportunity to meet students. Every student is required to take his course on the spirituality of everyday life, during which the rector engages students in thinking about life’s deepest questions:

There is such ease between the rector and the students. . . . The rector may come up and ask how you are doing and chat with you. He may not recall your name, as it is not possible to remember everyone, but he asks and pays attention to you. The dean acts the same way (from interview with a 4th-year student).

Students reflected that interactions with UCU faculty and staff provided opportunities for community-building in UCU through extracurricular activities. Additionally, such interactions were both enjoyable and intellectually stimulating because of the caliber of UCU faculty:

There is a very high concentration of well-rounded and well-educated people, with whom it’s a pleasure to interact and communicate about ideas, some type of informal organizations, events, concerts, meetings, cinema clubs, choirs, dances (from interview with a 4th-year male student).

UCU leaders are very accessible to students. Interviewed students said that it was not unusual for a student group to schedule a meeting with a department chair, a dean, or
vice provosts (vice rectors) of the university. Such accessibility and willingness to engage with students and help address any issues they may be facing is not common for the majority of Ukrainian universities. Peers of UCU students are often surprised to learn about the ease and the eagerness of UCU leadership to engage with students. One student reflected:

I have a friend who is a student at the Ivan Franko National University and when I mentioned to him that I am meeting today after classes with the dean, he was very surprised, because at his university the dean would be meeting with a whole stream—the whole class of students—and here the dean meets with a group of 22 people (from interview with a 4th-year male student).

The moral climate at UCU includes an atmosphere of freedom, openness, and tolerance. UCU students have also described the atmosphere in the university as one of “freedom and freshness, [where] a student can realize himself as much as he chooses... [This] stimulates motivation that we have... a variety of choices, we have opportunities about where to turn and to apply [our] energy” (from interview with a 4th-year female student). Students have an opportunity to participate in formal and informal activities and exercise both creativity and leadership. As one student expressed it, “For example, somebody who loves photography took many photos of our students and is creating a photo exhibition... [Such hobbies] stimulate inner development and motivation. Each student has an opportunity to realize his or her abilities” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).
Furthermore, students and faculty members reported finding a caring and tolerant community in UCU regardless of their faith background. Despite the school’s strong Christian identity, there is “no pressure, no indoctrination—we are a family, a small family” (from interview with a 4th-year student). One student reflected that she knew of faculty members and at least one student who were atheists:

[The atheist faculty and student] find it comfortable to study in Ukrainian Catholic University. [One] doesn’t feel any pressure. Truly, there is the sense of freedom and everybody chooses what they want to do and how they view themselves and every thought is respected (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The moral climate includes strong support of academic freedom. UCU leaders and faculty members are at the forefront of Ukraine’s national movement for academic freedom. They contribute to the national policy dialogue and convene a variety of events that facilitate free discussion on this topic. In addition, individual faculty members know they would not be reprimanded for not coordinating their public position with the university administration; they feel that they are trusted to represent their positions publicly, as individuals and as UCU community members. UCU faculty members and leaders find support from the rest of the UCU community and have a deep sense of a shared institutional mission and vision by the entire UCU community.

The moral climate includes a strong experience of community. In UCU, community is a context, purpose, and instrument of students’ civic and moral formation. Strong community and caring relationships are important values at UCU. As indicated by
previous research (Clark & Ladd, 2000; Kochanska, 2002; Kochanska, Aksan, & Koenig, 1995; Kochanska et al., 2004; Lapsley, 2008; Lapsley & Narvaez, 2006; Noddings, 2008; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b; Solomon, Watson, Battistich, Schaps, & Delucchi, 1992), caring relationships, attachment, belonging, and concern for each person (student, staff, and faculty), and opportunities to contribute meaningfully to the school community are important to student moral development.

Because UCU faculty members and staff embrace the university’s principles and values, UCU students report the same level of freedom, respect, and care. The impact of UCU’s atmosphere of care and trust is far-reaching. It empowers and motivates students to openly explore new horizons in their academic and co-curricular learning. A 4th-year student described her experience as follows:

I met many people who positively influenced me, motivated me, moved me to think about the different life questions. I feel and I experienced such a . . . virtual unity. . . . There is a series of such complex systems and [yet] it happens somehow spontaneously. . . . In my interactions this all happens without any pressure. [Even my bus driver] communicates with me . . . with the goal of influencing my moral and ethical character (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

The moral climate includes a sense of humor and a spirit of joy. The UCU community is penetrated by the spirit of joy, which can be illustrated by the use of humor. For UCU leaders, “Humor is a symbol of life. Humor is perspective of endless unexpected, something new. Humor is the ability to see things with fresh eyes” (from
interview with Leader 7). It is an outflow of openness to new things. Such openness to new things includes rejoicing in the opportunities to meet and welcome new people to the community. Humor opens the UCU community members to creativity and innovation, an important aspect of the academic process and rigorous learning in UCU.

Throughout the school year, UCU holds a number of university-wide community-building events, at which communal unity, humor, and hospitality can be observed. Some of these events may focus on traditional holiday celebrations, some on service projects, and others on applying spiritual practices to daily lives. These events may be initiated by students, alumni, or faculty, or in collaboration among them. One such event has become an annual tradition known as “The Day of Laughter” and takes place around April 1st every year. Another UCU community tradition, *Jordanska Vjazanka*, takes place at Christmastime. It is a festive community gathering, with food, music, and caroling, that includes students, faculty, and their families and children.

The moral climate in UCU produces moral feelings that are intrinsic to moral formation. The moral atmosphere in UCU give students a sense of safety, acceptance, and freedom; it encourages them to pursue knowledge and explore new horizons of learning in new fields and to do so in the context of a caring community that models moral reasoning and ethical citizenship. Student participants in the current study repeatedly emphasized the strong community they had found at UCU, which felt like a family. This atmosphere of authentic care and unity, the sense of freedom and opportunity, and the accessibility of leadership have offered students and faculty an environment that is not typical for Ukrainian universities. The atmosphere in UCU, as one student shared,
emanated a sense of communal unity and belonging: “There is such a spirit of unity, and it does change [us] at least a little. It frees a person” (from interview with a 4th-year female student). Furthermore, the data indicates that moral climate in UCU supports students in freely exploring moral answers to societal issues and thus promotes the development of moral reasoning.

Summary of Findings for Research Question Two

UCU leaders have stressed that part of today’s problems in Ukraine is not only the decline of national state standards, but also decline of morality. In this context, they view the role of the church and its institutions (including UCU) as serving as a moral and ethical compass to Ukrainian society and as educating a new generation of Ukrainian citizens to be persons of moral character, informed by Christian tradition and values, and ready to live their personal and professional lives in a manner that upholds the integrity and the dignity of others. UCU leaders believe that educating such a new generation is UCU’s primary mission. As one of the leaders mentioned in a media interview, when there is a critical mass of such moral change agents who occupy various leadership roles in politics and business, Ukraine’s trajectory could be changed (from interview with Leader 6).

Empowered by this vision and mission of forming a new generation of young professionals capable of transforming the nation, UCU leaders believe that the mission of a university in today’s Ukraine must include the moral and civic formation of students. UCU leaders recognize the fact that every aspect of UCU’s institutional culture, educational curriculum, and extracurricular programming play an important role in
students’ personal moral and character formation. In particular, the task of creating a moral environment within UCU that models a culture of integrity, action, community, dialogue, and tolerance and that facilitates the moral, ethical, and civic formation of students is viewed by UCU leaders as a primary responsibility of UCU to Ukrainian society (as stated earlier in the text).

This relationship between moral character, ethical behavior, and engaged citizenship are important elements in UCU leaders’ views on the educational process at UCU. Many of UCU’s institutional practices align with these views. In addition, many UCU institutional policies and practices would be considered by the theoretical framework for this study as factors supporting students’ moral and civic formation. The next section, Finding 3, outlines these institutional elements, drawing on the theories of moral development and character education previously discussed in Chapter 3.

**Findings for Research Question Three**

Research Question Three was “How do UCU leaders view their leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation?” Data suggests that UCU leaders view their personal agency and personal example as important factors in students’ moral and civic formation. As indicated by the previous research presented in Chapter 3, role modeling by important adults and, particularly, by university leaders is a key factor in facilitating students’ moral and civic formation (Colby et al., 2003). Likewise, UCU leaders believe that principled leadership and intentional modeling (or “personal witnessing,” as several leaders expressed it) are the key to creating a positive learning environment for students. As one leader expressed it, “to educate first of all means to be what you believe in” (from
interview with Leader 2). In addition, through personal modeling, UCU leaders invite the entire university community to embody the values and the principles that are intrinsic to the university’s identity. In leading by example, they initiate and lead the process of transformational education and position the university as a space and platform for dialogue and open communication between various environments of Ukrainian society.

For Research Question Three, there were five themes:

1. UCU leaders believe that the most important qualities to exemplify for students’ moral formation are valuing the dignity of the human person, service to others, self-sacrifice for the common good, and solidarity, inclusiveness, and community—achieved through open communication.

2. UCU leaders believe that personal modeling is the way for UCU to fulfill its mission.

3. The rector’s personal example in particular plays an important role in students’ formation.

4. Students perceive UCU leaders to be positive role models.

5. UCU leaders also seek for the institution itself to be a model and example for students’ moral and civic formation.

The UCU senior administration consists of 18 people, and the study findings indicate that each of them consciously seeks to model moral qualities. In particular, UCU leaders seek to apply the CST principle of valuing human life and dignity to all areas of their lives and serve as positive role models. UCU leaders believe that valuing the dignity of the human person is the most important moral quality to exemplify for students. This
moral quality, manifested in several different ways, undergirds all the discovered subthemes that comprise this finding. It is accomplished at UCU by several means. Chief among these are simple, everyday practices such as consistently communicating with students with respect, being open with them, choosing words and illustrations carefully, and enforcing institutional policies on academic integrity and intolerance of corruption. These behaviors, one leader stated, “polish the student’s formation” (from interview with Leader 5).

Service to others is also a moral quality that UCU leaders seek to exemplify. The leaders’ philosophy of leadership is based on, as one leader plainly said, the “Christian principle of service” (from interview with Leader 6). Faculty and administration help one another as needed, without regard to anyone’s position or status. This nonhierarchical practice of service is not experienced as an onerous duty: “I take pleasure in serving someone,” one leader said, “and this is a part of the UCU community ethos” (from interview with Leader 6).

As suggested by data from interviews and artifacts, self-sacrifice and commitment to the common good is another moral quality that leaders seek to exemplify. The findings indicate that UCU faculty members and administrators are powerful models of commitment to UCU and its mission, even though such commitment may have hindered their progress toward the types of materialistic goals found in the wider society. Uniformly well-educated and accomplished experts in their respective fields, many of them holders of foreign degrees, they made a personal sacrifice to work at UCU, because their employment incomes would have been much higher if they had chosen to work in
the business sector. The rector elucidated that such sacrifice and desire to serve rather than be served edified the community because “it gets passed on [to the rest of the university] from that very sacrifice. . . . This is a great posture of witnessing.” He believed that such witnessing was not merely found in specific individuals but was the spirit of the academic community at UCU.

Open communication is another quality that UCU leaders seek to exemplify, as indicated by data from the leaders’ interviews. Leaders exemplify open communication through both word and action by several means. Chiefly, leaders earnestly seek to communicate the university’s vision and values. They attempt this formally and informally through official university documents, the weekly university-wide worship service known as the liturgy, community-building events, service and advocacy by leaders and faculty for justice and national transformation, as well as the integrated educational process itself. In the Wednesday weekly liturgy, for example, the rector or one of the administrators shares news with students that the students otherwise would not know, such as issues the university is facing or new, upcoming events, and takes time to informally talk and interact with students. At this time students feel the administrators “are close to us,” as the 4th-year female student reported. In Ukraine, such open communication and creation of space for dialogue are uncommon. The UCU leadership works toward reversing this trend through the ways it communicates with the university and the broader community.

Data from interviews with UCU leaders and students suggest that UCU leaders believe that action, not talk, is a key to students’ moral and civic formation, in the face of
the empty promises common in Ukrainian society. One leader considered that when moral formation rather than merely imparting information is the goal, then “the best educator is human example and not what a person says, because many people talk about spiritual well-being and moral health” but do not act on them (from interview with Leader 6).

The leaders believe that personal modeling is also the practical way for UCU to fulfill its mission. It is a critical factor in fulfilling the university’s goal of institutional witnessing to Ukrainian society that it is possible to construct social relations and create organizations that uphold human dignity. Along these lines, another leader reflected on his own principle that “if you have the opportunity [to do something good], do it first yourself and then convince others.” Action, not talk, can be effective in Ukrainian society because “there are too many empty promises. People in Ukraine do not believe [them] and thus personal example . . . has more results and carries more weight than something that can be stated by a [government] decree or an [official] order” (from interview with Leader 5).

Another leader detailed the mechanism by which he believed personal example alone can change the world. Rather than by force, it works by a kind of benevolent contagion:

One does not come to change the world with weapons, tanks. . . . A person influences the world by the power of personal example, personal attitude. One must witness and, through witnessing change, ignite other people, serve as an example and hope that this example will be caught by
someone, who will want to become like you (from interview with Leader 3).

Apparently, as indicated by students’ interviews, the rector’s example helps form students, not only directly, but also indirectly, through its effect on the rest of the university’s faculty and administrators. UCU students and the members of the UCU senior administration emphasized the impact of the university’s rector on UCU as an organization and on its individual members. He was instrumental in rebuilding UCU in the post-Soviet era and inspiring his colleagues with the compelling vision of UCU as a missional community of transformational learning. The rector reflected that the vision was instilled in him by his mentor, Cardinal Josyf Slipyj, and was instilled via his own experiences in a transformational community of learning while in Rome. According to Leader 7, Cardinal Slipyj played a key role in inspiring a shared vision, creating a culture of dialogue, and facilitating continuing critical engagement with Ukrainian and global society. As students observed the rector’s role in their own formation, they stated that, for example, he was an “undeniable leader that forms us as citizens, as people, and as Christians. . . . He articulates and expresses . . . his own opinion and . . . vision on any situation that unfolds” (from interview with a 4th-year male student). UCU leaders observed the power of the rector’s example in creating a caring community, in taking a deep interest in students and colleagues, and in his ability to intentionally model respect for human dignity in his own work—in his relationship with students, in preaching, and during forums with student participation. He also periodically invited students to his house for dinner and conversation.
In his leadership of UCU, the rector is guided by such CST themes as respect for and value of life and dignity of the human being, solidarity, inclusion, community, and the common good. He is perceived as creating an atmosphere of dialogue and consensus and as having an ability to build relationships and through this to create a truly democratic process, inclusive community, and participatory decision-making, while strengthening an overall institutional community. According to the UCU leaders interviewed for the current study, this type of consensus-building dynamic in leadership is extremely rare in Ukrainian universities. However, as indicated by previous research, university leaders play a key role in educating (via institutional processes and policies) undergraduate students for democratic citizenship, moral character, and civic responsibility (Colby et al., 2003; Maldonado et al., 2007). One leader who had worked under the rector for 11 years was still impressed with his leadership style:

I have not witnessed a single time when [the rector] slammed a table with his fist and said, “I want it this way.” . . . He always builds consensus. If he sees that there is no complete agreement . . . he defers the issue and then begins to work with people. . . . This is such a fantastic ability to build relationships. . . . He created a unique atmosphere in the rectorate [i.e., university administration], which simply does not exist in other institutions. . . . [His style] is invitation to action (from interview with Leader 6).

Students perceive UCU leaders to be positive role models. Students reported that after arriving at UCU they felt a level of respect from UCU leaders that was
unprecedented and without comparison in their experience of Ukrainian society. Students attributed their success to the high level of respect and the overall positive moral atmosphere within the university. Students underscored the leaders’ and faculty members’ striving for excellence that they observed daily. It motivated the students to reassess their own attitudes and practices and to develop the desire to excel in their own lives and to become better people. As one of the students expressed it, “We feel respect and we feel a kind of spiritual guidance. . . . The vast majority of our employees, teachers, somehow by example . . . encourage and move us toward learning, toward respect, gratitude, toward forgiveness” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

In addition to the intentional personal modeling of the character traits and specific behaviors that reflect the value of the life and dignity of a human person, UCU leaders emphasize the necessity of upholding this and other CST values at an institutional level. They seek to make these values core principles of the university’s institutional identity, by making policies and practices that create an organizational culture that upholds such values in a systematic way. As the rector reflected, “I think that employees and students . . . see that the university establishes these principles and puts them at the center of attention, and moreover this influences the structures and dynamics of management and the advancement of the University.”

UCU leaders are intentional in creating institutional policies and administrative mechanisms that support the school’s moral climate. For example, the leaders base their selection of faculty members and expectations for faculty not only on professional qualifications, but also on specific principles and moral standards. Some of these
institutional policies and administrative mechanisms have been documented; however, many have not been made explicit or written down as formal policies but have become an undeniable part of the university’s culture. For example, mutual respect is one such institutional value that is the behavioral expectation of all members of the UCU community, including students, faculty, and staff. A typical student mentioned being:

struck by the deepest respect that exists between students and employees and the faculty members. I have not observed any rudeness [or] snobby behavior. I have seen very healthy relationships; it is very simple (from interview with 4th-year female student).

In a similar way, UCU’s policies governing its finances, organizational governance, and human resources promote institutional excellence and uphold UCU’s value of human dignity. These policies support UCU’s organizational transparency, integrity, and democratic governance. Some of the policies have been formally established and documented; others have not been documented and exist within the broader framework of institutional values, particularly the value of human dignity. All of the interviewees described the atmosphere in UCU as open and corruption-free. The university’s rector explained this atmosphere in UCU as owing to the fact that the university is established on virtues and values that aim “in every possible way to recognize and show respect for human dignity.” The existence of such an organizational ethos requires leaders’ intentionality, availability, and enforcement of institutional policies that reflect institutional values.
UCU leaders place a strong emphasis not only on the personal integrity of faculty, leaders, and students, but also on UCU’s institutional integrity. They recognize that the university’s role is not only in educating a new type of leadership for Ukraine. They also view UCU’s institutional integrity and transparency as part of its transformational mission to Ukrainian society. An example of an institutional policy that promotes transparency in the university’s finances is the policy on charitable donations. The rector acknowledged that several years ago the university did not have such a policy. However, as the atmosphere of corruption in society increased, the leadership, concerned with being unprotected from the influence of oligarchs’ monetary donations to the university, established a clear policy “that covered . . . how, from whom, and under what conditions the university can accept money from donors for charitable giving” (from interview with Leader 7).

Another policy was established in 2003, not long before the presidential election, to guide the university’s participation in the political processes in Ukraine. As the pressures in society mounted and higher education institutions were coerced by authorities to support certain political forces, UCU leaders responded by creating a university policy document titled Ukrainian Catholic University and Elections. This document aims to protect civil rights of the UCU community and to ensure that the name of UCU is not associated in the minds of Ukrainian citizens with any political party. In this document, as well as in numerous media statements, UCU leaders underscored the necessity of free and fair elections as a mechanism for democracy:
All UCU students, faculty, and staff, being citizens of Ukraine, are free in their political views in the election times. UCU is called to cultivate among members of its community a common culture of freedom and civic responsibility. Administrative pressure regarding their political convictions and expression of their rights during elections or national referenda is not acceptable.

Although UCU does not promote particular political parties, it recognizes and encourages students’ and staff’s civic responsibility by encouraging participation in political and social movements that advance and promote the value of human dignity. The above document clearly articulates conditions under which representatives of various political parties can participate in public lectures, discussions, and dialogue as the means to educating the UCU community. However, the document states that public presentations should not provoke violence or violate the university’s constitution.

In a similar way, university leaders have begun to formally articulate organizational policies that govern the school’s day-to-day operations. Until recently, many of UCU’s institutional principles and values that guided its operations were conveyed orally. Although the university seemed to be succeeding in implementing its mission, its leaders recognized the importance of institutionalizing these policies. As noted above, they have established in writing policies and procedures for finances, governance, scholarships, and admissions, and criteria for assessing university processes.

University governance principles support democratic governance and promote students’ moral formation. UCU leaders seek to be guided by CST in their approach to
university governance. The UCU rector emphasized the importance of “openness and transparency” in discussing the university’s finances. One particular of CST that the school employs is that of *subsidiarity*. In this context the rector stated that subsidiarity “means that decisions would be made on the lowest level. In this way it’s not dictatorship that comes from the top. . . . [Decision-making takes place] from the department to the dean's office, from the dean's office to the rectorate office, and this is done through dialogue.” A good illustration of the way subsidiarity is practiced is the development of UCU’s budget. UCU has 35 administrative units, and, as the first step in the university budgeting process, the unit leadership creates their annual budgets. After that, the budgets are “coordinated and agreed on through a dialogue within the university hierarchies” (from interview with UCU rector).

In a similar way, as indicated by the rector, the employee evaluation and promotion process (including salary increases) takes place in a “dialogical form, meaning that when you’re working in one of these 35 units what you do first is self-assessment, and then your immediate supervisor gives an assessment, and then these evaluations are agreed on and then the joint evaluation.” The rector stressed that the roots of these principles were in the value of human dignity found in its Christian origins: “The basis for this approach is . . . Christian anthropology, which explains who the human being is and that the human being is full of dignity. After all, it’s this very same Christian anthropology that became the foundation for Western civilization and democracy.” While conceding that this approach required extra time and effort, he concluded it was yet worth
the trouble, because “it has a long-lasting goal and it’s very integrative [for the entire school].”

Another example that illustrates UCU’s intentionality in developing democratic institutional structures is the systemic approach by UCU leadership to structuring governance processes and policies in a way that supports student moral development. UCU leaders believe that there is a strong relationship between the university’s moral mission, the moral root of Ukrainian society’s problems, and the university’s role in students’ character and civic education. They ensure that the university has structures, processes, and policies that allow the school to facilitate students’ moral and civic formation. One dean reflected on the reasons for and benefits of having an associate dean position dedicated solely to character and civic education, and its apparent success:

Direct contact and dialogue with students is very important. . . . Through this position of the associate dean . . . we propose certain values . . . and students become re-translators of these values. . . . Some of our students are from at-risk families . . . and they positively influence their own families and those environments they came from. . . . We see positive examples of such changes (from interview with Leader 5).

UCU human resources policies intend to promote students’ moral formation. The data collected for the current study indicates that (a) UCU leaders strongly believe in the impact on students’ moral formation of university faculty and staff members’ modeling of principled living and ethical behaviors and (b) UCU students have verified the power of such personal example and modeling. As a result of their beliefs, UCU leaders have
taken specific steps to ensure that UCU’s policies governing the university’s human resources reflect these values and ensure that UCU’s staff are supporting and promoting UCU students’ moral and civic formation. Though a distinctly Christian university, UCU is nonetheless open to hiring professional and academic staff regardless of their religious background. The main criteria are that the employees possess the required training, knowledge, and skills; are concerned with the development of students; and adhere to institutional values, particularly the value of human dignity. UCU’s rector reflected on how the value of human dignity as well as qualities he called *realism* and *normality* determined how he assessed prospective job candidates:

[I look for someone] who is able to normally relate to other people, who doesn't create conflict upon conflict . . . who looks at issues with realism, who evaluates himself with realism, who communicates with realism, who with realism analyzes situations, who treats and relates to others normally and accepts their dignity. My desire is to uphold this dignity (from interview with UCU rector).

Moreover, institutional modeling does not stop at the level of the UCU community, because institutional action is also a response to societal challenges in the outside community. UCU maintains a posture of dialogue with the broader society. One of the examples illustrating this unity of personal and institutional modeling occurred when UCU’s rector refused to collaborate with Ukraine’s national security services (the SBU) during the time of the Orange Revolution (Gudziak, 2010). One of the study
participants recalled the situation, the rector’s response, and its impact on the UCU students:

When SBU agents came to the university, an agent walked into his office and requested him to provide information [on students] and to watch those students that posed some protest potential. He refused. For students, it is very important to know that their rector . . . does not sell them behind their backs. This had an incredible impact on students. They felt protected by their rector (from interview with Leader 6).

Yet another example of modeling to the wider society is found in how UCU engages in the national dialogue on shared human values, human dignity, and personal integrity. The rector, together with a team of other UCU leaders, leaders of the Ukrainian academic community, and prominent Ukrainians from a variety of fields, initiated and led a national campaign for integrity and values transformation. Such initiatives and the rector’s example in leading them helped form in students and faculty the belief that, as one leader expressed it, they could “change, if not the world, then at least the environment around us” (from interview with Leader 5).

**Summary of Findings for Research Question Three**

Informed by CST, UCU leaders believe in personal agency and modeling and provide explanations for their important role in students’ civic and moral formation. This belief is supported by their personal examples of respect, service, self-sacrifice, and humility (not standing upon status), and by institutional practices. The UCU policies and practices described in this finding promote personal and institutional integrity, justice,
and democratic governance. These practices also involve advocacy, service, open communication, and political action. Students perceive a unique moral climate and their own positive moral formation aided by such personal and institutional modeling. Through these policies and practices, UCU leaders created in the university a positive moral climate that, in turn, supports students’ moral feeling, promotes moral knowing, and offers opportunities for moral action (Figure 2). A related institutional practice, and the foremost, is the educational process itself.

**Findings for Research Question Four**

Regarding Research Question Four, “How do UCU leaders view UCU’s institutional role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduates and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?” UCU leaders believe that UCU’s institutional role is to educate students for moral character and civic engagement through a holistic, integrated, and developmentally appropriate process. Three themes emerged for this finding:

1. UCU leaders believe that university education must be integrative.
2. UCU aims to promote moral formation by supporting moral knowing and moral reasoning.
3. UCU’s institutional policies and practices intend to foster the development of moral character and engaged citizenship by promoting moral knowing and a life of moral action.

Data from interviews and artifacts suggest that UCU leaders view the formation of the whole person to be the goal of the educational process. They explained that their
aim was to prepare students who not only excel academically but also are capable of living principled lives of ethics, morals, and personal integrity. Furthermore, the data indicate that UCU leaders believe university should be the place that facilitates moral formation. One of the UCU leaders defined moral formation as “[a process that encourages] altruism, inquisitiveness, love for truth, intellectual honesty, and openness, self-critique, respect, and tolerance of others’ thoughts” (from interview with Leader 2).

All UCU leaders in this study indicated that, as much as is practical, academic subjects should be taught with a view toward their relevance for moral formation.

UCU leaders expressed their belief that university education for moral formation must be integrative. Forming a moral person is more than simply teaching students about morality and requires that learning engage the whole person. Education of the whole person is understood by UCU leaders as a holistic and integrated process that involves education of the mind but also motivations and feelings as well as prompting to action—education of the head, heart, and hands. Data from interviews, documents, and artifacts, suggest that UCU seeks to prepare students for the whole of life, to (a) have academic expertise in their specific fields and the ability to critically reflect on and engage with multiple dimensions of life, (b) express care and compassion for and affirm the dignity of others, and (c) lead lives of integrity, service, and active citizenship.

To accomplish such a holistic education, they believe, the process itself must be an integrated one that involves not only academic learning but diverse extracurricular opportunities, carefully designed living spaces with structured community building, community engagement programming, and service opportunities. “Education in the
classroom,” said one leader, “is only half of education. That means that education also
takes place outside the classroom and outside the university. Therefore, the university
must find different ways to . . . [open or expose] . . . students, young people, to a concept
of the common good, which should unite different people” (from interview with Leader
1).

   Education occurring outside the classroom, however, must still occur within the
context of a caring school community that upholds human dignity. As described earlier in
this chapter, for UCU leaders, perceiving and respecting human dignity is the foremost
goal of moral formation. Leaders believe that this respect for human dignity begins with
oneself. As the rector expressed it:

   The university encourages a person to see his or dignity and his or her wholeness .
   . . . we propose to each student to open his or her soul, to see his or her divine
dignity and to see the dignity of a neighbor, and to care for this dignity; when it is
let down, to raise it up.

To complete the circle, caring for another person promotes the moral formation of the
one who cares. “It is in service [to others],” the rector said, “that a human being becomes
truly human.” Education, therefore, is for UCU leaders a moral mission, as they strive to
educate people capable of respecting, recovering, and upholding the humanity and
dignity of human beings.

   UCU intends to promote moral formation by supporting moral knowing and
moral reasoning. As discussed in Chapter 3, previous research defines moral formation as
a process consisting of three components: the formation of moral values, of moral
reasoning, and of moral character (Berkowitz, 1991). In turn, moral character is represented by moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action (Lickona, 1991). Moral knowing includes moral awareness, moral values, the ability to take perspective of others, moral reasoning, moral decision-making, and self-knowledge. Moral action is represented by competence, will, and habit (Lickona, 1991). As indicated by the previous research, moral character can be achieved through intentional education focused on the development of moral habits (or virtues) that are later transformed into moral character (Ryan, 1989; Wynne, 1987).

The study data suggests that UCU is very intentional in developing students’ moral knowing and moral reasoning through integrating such practices as curriculum design, classroom instruction, reflection, discussion of moral dilemmas, dialogue on varying values positions, and engagement in co-curricular activities and community service. Interviews with leaders and students conducted during this study indicate that the key learning outcomes they aim for are the formation of moral values, of moral reasoning, and of moral character. Although these learning outcomes were not clearly and formally articulated in UCU’s internal documents, these were clearly stated during the interviews and were the focus of internal administrative and faculty discussions, within the broader context of Ukrainian society and the university’s mission, discussed earlier in this findings section. UCU leaders structure the educational process (which includes academic and extracurricular programming) and the school environment in a way that promotes the formation of an ethical and engaged citizen.
Data from interviews with UCU leaders indicate that they take an intentional approach to creating an integrated moral learning process. They believe that character formation is a holistic process and takes place both inside and outside the classroom. They emphasize that university leaders and faculty members “should serve as models of professional ethics” (from interview with Leader 3). They also believe that character education should be a comprehensive process that is intentionally integrated across the university academic curriculum, as well as within extracurricular programming and student residencies, all of which must be integrated in the campus-wide process of student character formation. The latter occurs through UCU leaders intentionally engaging with students in (a) spiritual and moral conversations and (b) joint work such as social volunteer work or extracurricular service.

During the interviews, students acknowledged their awareness that the university leaders work tirelessly for their students’ success and to educate truly moral and engaged citizens for Ukraine. Whether it is through international fundraising trips or through their presence in a public sphere, or through teaching and research, UCU leaders are perceived as deeply committed to their students. As a 4th-year female student noted, “All of them are trying so hard for us, for students. They simply want to raise conscious citizens . . . who would be willing to develop this country. They indeed put their whole lives into this” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

Interview data also suggest that UCU leaders are cognizant of the developmental needs of the late adolescence stage of most UCU students, and they approach the educational process in a manner that is intentional and deliberate for that age group.
UCU’s approach finds support in previous research, which suggests that an intentional and integrated approach to character education contributes to the development of postconventional judgment and autonomy (Narvaez, 2005; Nucci & Lee, 1993; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b; Watson et. al., 1989). In addition, students engage with peers and faculty members in their classes about the issues of their daily lives, and the ways these may relate to their public judgments and actions. The academic curriculum allows for such meaningful interactions, particularly because all students take required core courses focused on presenting the university’s Christian values system.

Data indicate that core courses and specialization electives include topics of moral formation. The core curriculum courses include a course on the spirituality of everyday life and such theologically focused courses as New Testament Foundations, Old Testament Foundations, Biblical Foundations, Church Liturgical Calendar, and Life of Saints. In addition, students take required and elective courses within their area of specialization, which is an uncommon structure for higher education programs in Ukraine. For example, student participants majoring in Social Pedagogy take such courses as Philosophy, Ethics, Family Social Services, Cultural Studies, and Psychological Counseling and Psychotherapy. Expert faculty members and professionals teach these courses and students greatly benefit from their expertise. However, some interviewed students, although satisfied overall with their curriculum, believed that they would have benefited from fewer theological courses and more courses in their specialization.
Students report that the greatest impact on their moral reasoning and moral knowing was not because of a specific course’s focus, but because of the faculty member or UCU administrator teaching that course. UCU leaders and faculty members willingly and openly engage in conversations with students during classes and outside regular class times, in communal spaces on UCU campus. This engagement and involvement with students may be described as informal mentoring. Students’ experiences at UCU affirmed the positive influence of faculty members’ role as moral exemplars of professional expertise, care, authenticity, and openness about their own life journeys.

In UCU, each student group (a cohort of about 30 students) has an assigned faculty adviser, who regularly meets with the students to discuss any issues or concerns, helping them with their moral knowing and moral reasoning. This faculty adviser may also mentor students as they face decisions about real life dilemmas and actions. However, as students indicated during the interviews, the quality of interactions with an adviser depended on that faculty member’s motivation for engaging with the students. The students described some very positive and meaningful interactions, where they observed an authentic desire to mentor and help. However, occasionally, students faced situation where an adviser did not show interest or motivation to interact with students for almost an entire academic year. At the same time, students also viewed this as an opportunity to develop their own leadership skills and learn to seek answers from the UCU’s administrators to the issues or concerns of their student group. Interestingly, even in such circumstances of inconsistent handling of their role by a faculty adviser, the UCU
environment fostered students’ development of higher levels of autonomy and enabled them to address issues and concerns they faced.

In addition to curricular learning, UCU promotes moral formation through co-curricular programs. These programs have an intentional, applied focus and can include an informal or formal student engagement element. Informal student engagement takes place through talks and conversations occurring at UCU community events. An example is the spiritual gatherings led by UCU leaders to connect what students study in UCU to the issues of everyday life, to critically think of these issues, and to reflect on students’ own roles. One such gathering was the 50th birthday celebration for the vice rector for mission. A 4th-year female student reflected on her experience of the vice rector’s address on this occasion:

This was a very sincere talk . . . with the whole university, [but] we had a sense as if [we were] in a private meeting at a coffee shop. He spoke about his life, starting with his student years. And . . . he did not talk about what we should be doing and how we should be doing it . . . Instead, it was about [what he did] and why he was speaking this message, what he was thinking [before] and how he now thinks differently—that he had made some mistakes. . . . It affected me to the very depths of my soul. To this day I remember it, and I believe that even if it were only for this two-hour talk, I would never regret entering UCU, because this was an experience that couldn’t be repeated (from interview with a 4th-year female student).
In addition, UCU faculty and administrators regularly organize events that provide UCU students with more formal opportunities for moral learning. These include lectures, seminars, conferences, and forums with Ukrainian and international experts, politicians, leaders, researchers, diplomats, artists, and writers. Students believe that such events are both educational and formational in nature, because students actively participate in these events through discussion of the relevant issues. These sessions are so meaningful to students that they are inspired to take on leadership roles in student-led initiatives:

Students when observing all this themselves want to act in a similar way, and they organize . . . performances . . . literary and art meetings. . . . In our university, we indeed see what is done . . . and it stimulates us to change (from interview with 4th-year female student).

Students also learn from informal discussions that follow formal presentations. The format of such faculty-organized events may be a conference or a lecture followed by a discussion. Typically, these events provide the opportunity not only to learn about a specific issue but also to learn from directly engaging in a meaningful conversation with the presenter after the presentation. One student recalled such an experience:

I attended . . . a lecture-discussion on “UCU in the Contemporary Political Situation in Ukraine.” Many people spoke at that event . . . . These were people who did not work at UCU [but] they were simply experts in [their fields]. After that, a reception was held, during which it was possible to discuss these issues in
an informal environment with anyone you wanted, when they were no longer addressing the whole audience (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

In addition, students receive regular e-mails from the university about internships and upcoming events, including international academic conferences, through a university-wide e-mail distribution. Participation in these events is optional; however, everyone has an opportunity to attend them. Students with good academic standing may be offered institutional fellowships that enable them to participate in events such as off-campus conferences. The opportunity to participate in such formal extracurricular learning opportunities inspires students to excel in their academics:

For example, if I know that I want to go somewhere I must discipline myself, I must work hard so that I have something [worthwhile to take] to a conference [for example], and this develops me well; I grow like a plant. Constantly, daily, we receive some type of announcements. . . . So students have a lot to choose from, they’re guided by their likes and then they work in a particular direction, they work hard, patiently and with determination and then go to present, defend, represent, and achieve certain results (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

UCU promotes moral knowing and reasoning through specific communal Christian spiritual practices. In UCU, both students as well as faculty members recognize that UCU is not a typical university for Ukraine because it gives specific attention to students’ moral and spiritual development. Spiritual practices serve as a moral compass and reinforce the university’s vision and values. The UCU rector regularly discusses with
students that the reason for his purposeful involvement in their moral formation is to prepare them for living in a broader human community. For example, on one occasion he told the students the following:

For me it would be a great achievement if you would learn to express with your life two words, or two phrases, thank you, and forgive me. Human gratitude enriches the human being. The person who is thankful is very rich, because through gratitude we recall all the gifts that we have received. In the beginning of our life, everything that we have is a gift. And when we’re grateful, we are happy. . . . And [regarding forgive me], in community we always step on each other’s feet (from interview with UCU rector).

Specific spiritual practices include daily liturgy, recollections, sermons, retreats, days of spiritual renewal, and weekly chapel or liturgy. These practices create a way for the entire community to embrace UCU’s identity, principles, and mission and to build a mission-centered community within UCU by continually communicating to its members the university’s values and vision.

Weekly chapel, for example, takes place every Wednesday and is an opportunity for the entire UCU community to gather for a time of spiritual reflection. The university library is closed during this time. Although attending chapel is an optional activity, the majority of students choose to go, because it gives them an opportunity not only to learn about the latest news and announcements, but also to experience a sense of a unified community and closeness to their UCU family. As a student observed, weekly chapel
meetings help “people understand that they participate in a bigger system, in the making of citizens and conscientious people and overall good people” (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

In addition, according to interviews with students and UCU leaders, the university regularly conducts weekend recollections. Recollection is what leaders describe as a spiritual practice of drawing one’s attention to the presence of God in the soul. Each member of the UCU community, faculty or students, may sign up for a specific weekend recollection. These recollections are shared communal experiences and times of guided reflection and silence. During the recollections, the rector addresses the students and “touches on real life issues, questions that . . . touch on human problems” (from interview with a 4th-year male student). Recollections enable members of the UCU community to reflect on the current issues they face individually or as a community through the lens of faith, spirituality, and deeper meaning.

UCU communal spiritual practices aim to encourage students’ moral knowing and moral reasoning. They create a focus and a sense of the community coming together to accomplish their shared vision and mission. However, these are all optional elements of UCU’s communal spiritual life. Students did not report any pressure to attend weekly liturgy, recollections, or retreats. Instead, they reported that they often attended because these practices benefited them and enriched their lives. UCU’s rector reflected on the effect such practices may have on students’ moral formation, and particularly on the development of such moral attributes as gratitude and reconciliation. He judged that they empowered students to live integrated lives and to apply the learning that takes place in
class, through co-curricular activities, and through spiritual practices to their daily situations and struggles.

The study data indicates that UCU’s institutional practices intend to foster the development of moral character and engaged citizenship by promoting a life of moral action. To achieve its vision of educating a new type of leader for Ukraine, UCU’s leaders wished to create distinct institutional culture and processes to prepare students for a lifelong commitment to justice, service, and civic engagement. As previously mentioned, UCU intentionally designed and integrated curricular and extracurricular programming to support these goals. The extracurricular programming includes service and engagement with UCU, the wider community, and Ukraine itself. The findings indicate six specific means that UCU leaders employ to encourage students to live lives marked by not only moral feeling and moral reasoning but also moral action, with the intention that a life marked by moral actions will continue after graduation.

UCU aims to promote a life of moral action by creating opportunities for students to take on leadership roles through extracurricular involvement. Students observed that many opportunities existed for leadership and taking initiative on extracurricular community involvement through both formal and informal student organizations:

Students take on leadership roles. We have a student government and we have the fraternity of students, which is a group of students who simply want to do something good, to organize something. . . . They gather their friends and come up with certain ideas; they go and do certain presentations and talks. We have a
lot of leadership opportunities like this (from interview with a 4th-year male student).

As an example, students described their initiation of a student radio project. A group of student leaders had an idea to create a radio program, in which they would interview UCU leaders and faculty and invite them into a dialogue with the student community in a housing residence. They discussed their idea with UCU leaders and felt encouraged to move forward. The series became successful because they created a space where students had an opportunity to get to know UCU leaders at a basic human level, to learn about their lives, and to ask questions. Furthermore, through this dialogic space, the initiative contributed to building community between UCU students and faculty. Such a meaningful sense of connection to the university motivates students to stay involved with the university even after graduation.

UCU students felt encouraged to lead a life of moral action when normal institutional practices were altered to allow students to take part in timely civil action. A 4th-year female student recalls her experience with a corporate response of the student body to the political situation that was created by the government’s decision to extend the stay of the Russian navy in Crimea:

All our community . . . students, faculty members, and everybody had an opportunity to come and express their thoughts. At the time we agreed that we would go to Kyiv to attend a demonstration. We had support of the university leadership, and our faculty members didn’t say, “[No, because] you will miss the classes.” Instead, they said that you are going but upon your return you must
make up for everything you missed (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

UCU students felt inspired to lead a life of moral action by their professors’ and leaders’ examples of advocacy for justice and service to the local community and Ukraine. UCU faculty members are active in their advocacy for justice, beyond teaching and research. They are actively engaged in service to the local community and Ukraine and emphasize the centrality of service to learning and to UCU culture by joining efforts with students in service to specific causes. Students reflected on the impact of leaders’ example on their formation:

We constantly have in front of us . . . a good example. And [the rector] and . . . faculty members share their experience with us. . . . When you see such a person, who knows several languages and who is so . . . holistically developed, you simply want to be like this person at least a little bit. In other words, you recognize that he achieved this with hard work and so you want to work hard in a similar way (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

UCU students were empowered to lead a life of moral action by availability of direct participation in democratic student government. All UCU students have opportunities to join the student government, formed through annual elections. Participation enables students to develop leadership skills in the context of a democratic organization. The 4th-year male student observed that at UCU, in contrast to other universities in Ukraine, elections are held for student leaders, and anyone can run for an
office. Informal group leaders, he said, have a good chance of being elected because “active people go to the student government.”

According to students’ interviews, once the UCU student leadership team is elected, it leads the student body in a number of initiatives. Student government organizes special social events, meetings with prominent people, and such events as coffee or tea dialogues with university administration to enable students to communicate with them in an open and safe environment. The student government also handles internal issues such as maintaining a student common room, buying furniture for the kitchen, and organizing sports competitions.

UCU aims to promote a life of moral action by providing opportunities for civic and community engagement through service. In UCU service is viewed as a way of learning and as a building block of civic formation; UCU leaders emphasized: “Learning does not stop in the classroom” (from interview with Leader 2). Previous studies pointed out that virtue is gained through experience and service (Hart et al., 2008; Pratt et al., 2003) and that youth participation in volunteer service is a predictor of youth developing higher stages of moral reasoning and moral attitudes (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Boss, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Franz & McClelland, 1994; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Hart et al., 2006; Leming, 2001; Nassi, 1981). UCU offers numerous opportunities for service within the university and within the local community in Lviv. As one student shared:

If you are interested in social work you may go to the orphanage and work there, if there is specific training [you need for social work], you can also do that. We
even had workshops on [helping] deaf people, workshops on sign language, and we also had courses and workshops on psychological counseling, and some type of a conference about iconography—different fields of humanities or another direction (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

UCU aims to promote a life of moral action by allowing and encouraging UCU alumni to continue their involvement with UCU through community activism. Many UCU alumni maintain their ties with UCU and continue their involvement with the university community through community activism. For example, a group of UCU alumni created an organization called Res-Familia. It consists of both UCU alumni and current students who engage the UCU and local Lviv communities in joint service to address local issues. Among other things, they organize charitable events as well as entertainment programs to address the needs of local orphanages and schools. One of the current male students observed, “Leaders of this [alumni] organization are truly interested in the charitable, selfless cultural and moral enrichment of society” (from interview with a 4th-year male student). These alumni volunteer their services and serve the greater community out of their convictions, a quality current UCU students greatly admire in them. Students shared that such instances of selfless giving are rare in Ukraine, and added that:

For these [volunteers] only people’s and children’s smiles are enough, as well as gratitude and the creation of a good atmosphere. . . . When I see these people do that I really admire them. . . . I’m pleased to see and to know that I study in this
university from where these wonderful people came (from interview with a 4th-year female student).

However, UCU’s promotion of a life of moral action does not eliminate post-graduation moral challenges. UCU leaders are realistic about the kind of difficulties their young graduates will be facing once they leave the nurturing and supportive environment at UCU:

Elements of this society are not always . . . ready to receive our students, and our students have problems of integrating others into this [moral] space. For instance, we do not have corruption [at UCU] . . . [but after graduation] students enter a different environment, where corruption is an element of tradition. . . . How should they act and coexist with such a system, and, moreover, how to change it? This is a great challenge for our graduates (from interview with Leader 6).

As an example, the UCU rector mentioned one student who “successfully graduated [and] was faced with getting a job [by] paying a $2000 bribe or remaining unemployed. UCU graduates face this kind of moral pressure that has direct economic implications” (from interview with Leader 6). The school keeps statistics on what happens to graduates, and one of the leaders said that about one third “manage well and they become members of communities, change them, become leaders and do this very well” (from interview with Leader 6). However, another third face challenging situations in the outside world that are “hard to get used to, let alone change . . . from within” (from interview with Leader 6). The vice rector for mission, reflecting on this postgraduation challenge, asserted his hope in the efficacy of not merely teaching ideals but modeling
them, of his and his colleagues’ personal examples. He said that he advised students that it was imperative to maintain one’s integrity whatever the cost:

One must choose to say “No, I am not going to go this way.” . . . I simply want to believe that when . . . my students hear about my collisions in life—with the KGB—and that I did not agree to become a KGB informant and ended up in prison for a decade . . . such an example . . . [will help] a person [with] choosing his way (from interview with Leader 6).

Data from student interviews indicate that study at UCU raises students’ awareness of the moral dilemmas they will face upon leaving UCU. The findings also indicate that education at UCU does have an impact on students’ future moral choices. However, the findings cast doubt on any conclusion that a UCU moral vaccination develops full immunity, so to speak, against corruption for every student. This is particularly true in the cases when students’ families and upbringing are not rooted in the same tradition of faith and morality found at UCU. This was indicated by an interview with a female student planning to go on to graduate school in a Ukrainian public university:

I know for sure that I will not be accepting bribes; I know this very clearly. However, whether I will pay bribes, I don’t know . . . . If I go to a different university [and] if there will be an opportunity to study well and pass the exam I will try and do my best. I am determined to fight. However, it is very often the case that one person cannot change the system if this person is just an ordinary student. Honest . . . this is what I
think. I will give a bribe if the whole group will be collecting money and if
the subject will be very hard (from interview with a 4th-year female
student).

In contrast, the 4th-year male student from a family of strong Christian faith
evinned a deeper integration of UCU’s mission and a perspective much broader than his
own personal road through life. This integration and perspective allowed him to express
an uncompromising determination to live counterculturally for the sake of the culture
itself—and to express hope:

I have thought about it for quite some time . . . and I have decided that . . .

I will never pay a bribe, not in any circumstance. . . . It will be very
difficult, but in this university we students . . . have set a goal for
ourselves. We want to destroy all these principles and stereotypes that our
society is accustomed to. This cannot go on forever. . . . Eventually,
Ukraine will change for the better. . . . And so we have chosen to model
these principles by our own example.

Despite the recognition of such moral challenges for their students, UCU leaders
are confident that the UCU experience shapes students in a way that facilitates personal
growth and lasting moral formation over the course of their studies at UCU. As the UCU
rector noted, “We observe very great dynamics and changes and we see, over time, that a
person changes.”
Summary of Findings for Research Question Four

UCU leaders believe they are on a mission to educate students for lives of active citizenship and personal integrity, which requires them to be persons of moral character who are also experts in their chosen fields. In UCU leaders’ view, university education is an integrated process that involves academic learning and promotes the development of moral character and civic engagement through socialization in the UCU community. They aim to structure the educational process and form an institutional culture in UCU that encourages the UCU community to uphold the value of human dignity and to model active citizenship.

The value of human dignity is central to UCU’s institutional policies and practices. The foundation of CST, according to UCU leaders, undergirds every dimension of UCU’s organization. Therefore, UCU aims to educate moral leaders who are ready to serve Ukraine and the broader global community with professional excellence and a striving to uphold human dignity. UCU takes deliberate steps to uphold the human dignity of students, faculty, staff, and broader community through institutional policies that promote integrity and justice. UCU policies prohibit any form of corruption. Subsequently, students applying to UCU know that UCU differs from other Ukrainian universities in its ethical standards. As a result, the practice of academic integrity and intolerance of corruption positively impacts students’ moral formation.

Also, institutional policies and practices that focus on institutional integrity and democratic governance support the development of students’ moral character and promote civic engagement. These policies enable the university to achieve its mission
and to promote students’ moral formation. They support the university’s financial integrity and transparency and recruitment and retention of quality faculty and staff and create an environment that upholds human dignity and promotes personal and institutional integrity. UCU policies and practices play a key role in the leaders’ intentions to create a positive moral atmosphere and promote the development of a moral character in the students (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). The institutional policies articulate UCU’s values and inform organizational practices and individual behaviors. The set of values espoused and enacted by the university is consistent with CST, described in Chapter 2. University leaders play a key role in facilitating students’ moral and civic formation, as they initiate these institutional policies and promote moral formation in other ways. They seek to model UCU institutional values in their personal and professional lives, and promote them at the national level through advocacy for social transformation to uphold dignity and integrity.

As discussed previously, UCU’s institutional identity is Christian, rooted in Catholic doctrine, and education at UCU is values-oriented. Therefore, as explained in Finding 1, the University’s institutional policies and practices seek to affirm the value of human dignity. The university is a mission-driven organization. UCU’s mission is to foster students’ moral and character formation and to prepare students for lives that uphold human dignity. This is reflected in the UCU mission statement:

The Ukrainian Catholic University is an open academic community living the Eastern Christian tradition and forming leaders to serve with professional excellence in Ukraine and internationally—for the glory of
God, the common good, and the dignity of the human person (from the UCU website).

The statement reflects the university values and its stand for dignity and against corruption and its goal of educating Ukraine’s moral elite. These values are also espoused by individual faculty members and leaders and by the university as a whole. UCU policies and practices play a key role in the leaders’ intentions to create a positive moral atmosphere and promote the development of a moral character in the students (Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). The institutional policies articulate UCU’s values and inform organizational practices and individual behaviors. The set of values espoused and enacted by the university is consistent with CST, described in Chapter 2. University leaders play a key role in facilitating students’ moral and civic formation, as they initiate these institutional policies and promote moral formation in other ways. They seek to model UCU institutional values in their personal and professional lives and promote them at the national level through advocacy for social transformation to uphold dignity and integrity.

**Summary**

This chapter provided details of the current study findings. The study findings indicate the following:

- Christian anthropology and Catholic Social Teaching (CST) serve as a foundation of UCU leaders’ philosophical framework.

- UCU leaders believe that UCU’s mission in Ukrainian society is to be an agent of social transformation by educating a new type of Ukrainian citizens, who are moral persons and active citizens in the country’s young democracy.
• UCU leaders view their personal agency and personal example as important factors in students’ moral and civic formation.

• UCU leaders believe that UCU’s institutional role is to educate students for moral character and civic engagement through a holistic, integrated, and developmentally appropriate process.

UCU leaders are inspired and guided in their work by philosophical framework rooted in Christian anthropology and CST. This philosophical framework informs their leadership of UCU in educating a new generation of moral leaders and in the university’s engagement with the world.

For this reason, UCU leaders’ belief in the importance of their personal example plays a prominent role in facilitating students’ moral and civic formation. In addition, the modeling of ethical practices is exemplified by UCU’s organizational practices and is supported by its institutional policies. UCU’s transformational mission is its response to the challenges of systemic corruption in Ukraine, as the university aims to educate moral persons who possess a deep sense of civic responsibility and are actively engaged in society. UCU’s mission reflects the university’s values and its stand for dignity, against corruption, and for the goal of educating a new generation of Ukrainian leaders.

UCU aims to fulfill its mission through its institutional practices and institutional policies that uphold integrity and promote justice. The moral climate in UCU supports students’ moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action. UCU leadership wishes to develop a moral climate that supports students’ moral feeling. Students experience institutional moral climate through their encounters with the distinctively corruption-free environment.
they find in UCU. The moral climate includes an atmosphere of care, kindness, respect, and trust. It is supported by the ways UCU leaders make it a priority to truly invest in students’ lives. The moral climate in UCU also includes an atmosphere of freedom, openness, and tolerance, as well as a strong sense of community that is full of joy. As a result, the institutional moral climate in UCU produces the kinds of moral feelings that are intrinsic to moral formation.

Further, UCU leaders intend to promote students’ moral formation by supporting moral knowing and moral reasoning. UCU leaders strive to intentionally create an integrated learning process by incorporating issues of ethics, morality, and values into the undergraduate curriculum and by providing opportunities for alternative meaning-making through the spiritual dimension in UCU’s educational process. Additionally, the research data indicate that UCU promotes moral action and prepares its students for a life of commitment to justice, service, and civic engagement. Finally, the research data indicate that UCU promotes a life of moral action by creating opportunities for students to take on leadership roles through extracurricular involvement and service opportunities, by altering normal institutional practices to allow students to take part in timely civil action, by being examples of advocacy for justice and service to the local community and Ukraine, and by allowing and encouraging UCU alumni to continue their involvement with UCU through community activism. Although these practices do not eliminate students’ postgraduation moral challenges and occasional failures, leaders are nonetheless confident that, overall, UCU’s institutional policies and practices foster moral character and engaged citizenship.
In the next chapter these findings are discussed and related to previous research. Implications of the findings are also considered for Ukraine’s post-Revolution of Dignity democratic reforms.
Chapter Five

This chapter presents a discussion of the research findings. When I began this research, I sought to understand the UCU leaders’ views of university-based student moral and civic formation and values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university. I was interested in how these values informed their understanding of UCU’s role in Ukraine’s democracy-building process, as well as the views of their own leadership roles in students’ moral and civic formation. In addition, I wanted to identify the ways UCU leaders’ views informed the university’s organizational mission and practices within the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transition.

This study explored the following research questions:

(1) How do UCU leaders describe the values and beliefs that guide their leadership of the university and how do these values and beliefs align with the university’s policies and practices?

(2) How do UCU leaders understand UCU’s institutional role in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

(3) How do UCU leaders view their leadership role in students’ moral and civic formation?
(4) How do UCU leaders view UCU’s institutional role in the moral and civic formation of undergraduates and how do these views align with the university’s policies and practices?

**Findings and Interpretation**

The final chapter begins with a discussion of UCU leaders’ philosophical framework. It continues with a narrative that presents the findings in the light of the literature reviewed for this study. I discuss UCU leaders’ role as mission-driven leaders and moral exemplars within the context of UCU’s institutional goal to educate students for moral character and civic engagement. I continue by focusing on the significance of UCU leaders’ perspectives on their role in students’ civic and moral formation and their intentionality in educating a new generation of leaders for Ukraine’s young democracy. In particular, I discuss the role of the UCU community in Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity. I conclude with the discussion of implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

The study data indicate that Christian anthropology and Catholic Social Teaching (CST) serve as a foundation of UCU leaders’ philosophical framework. As stated in Chapter 2, the theoretical framework for this study is rooted in theories of moral development and character education. However, the interview data with UCU’s leaders showed that the core of the leaders’ philosophical framework for university leadership was CST. In a Catholic philosophical framework, CST informs UCU leaders’ faithful action as it applies to UCU’s context—within the institution, as well as within Ukraine’s national context. In addition, application of CST in the field of education was further
developed by the Jesuit tradition within Catholicism and is focused on education for social justice. CST values and principles are prominent in UCU leaders’ philosophy of education and leadership. To align study participants’ responses with these CST themes presented in Chapter 2, these have been grouped into two categories: (a) respect for and value of life and dignity of the human being and (b) solidarity, inclusion, community, and the common good. The UCU leaders have continuously emphasized the value of life and dignity of the human person as the fundamental principle and the cornerstone of their leadership and educational philosophy and practice. Stemming from their identity as bearers of the divine image who live in solidarity and unity with their creator, human beings are called to resemble the union existing in the divine persons of the Trinity—the union of truth and love—in their relationship with other human beings. Solidarity can be learned only through personally encountering it through direct experiences (Bergman, 2011) and through personal involvement with injustice and the suffering of the innocent, which may serve as a catalyst for critical reflection and personal change (Kolvenbach, 2005).

It would be reasonable to expect that UCU leaders’ adherence to CST and to the UCU mission of transformative education would lead to a deeper engagement in the efforts of national transformation by participating in dialogue about the government’s existing character education policy framework. Interestingly, however, all UCU leaders acknowledged that they were not familiar with the details of Ukraine’s national character education policies. One possible critique of UCU leadership here may be that UCU leaders could have initiated a dialogue with the national stakeholders on the role of
character education in the future of Ukraine’s democracy. Such engagement could follow the pattern of the successful dialogue UCU leaders already have with Ukraine’s higher education community on the issues of university autonomy and academic freedom.

However, the most unexpected discovery in this study occurred much later, after the analysis had been completed and the findings were being written. I decided to find the original document cited in one of the CST sources, the aforementioned *Characteristics of Jesuit Education*, and discovered the rich history and tradition of Jesuit education and its well-developed pedagogy, Ignatian pedagogy, which defines Catholic education in schools and universities worldwide. Interestingly, neither Jesuit teaching nor the term Ignatian pedagogy itself had been mentioned by any of the study participants. The most striking part of this discovery was to find an almost identical parallel between the themes derived from analysis of the interviews and documents and the characteristics of Ignatian pedagogy (discussed in Chapter 4). Data from interviews and documents indicated that elements of this framework were present in UCU’s pedagogical practices. The main principle of Jesuit pedagogy, inseparability of love and deeds, of faith and love of justice (Bergman, 2011), has been identified in this study as the key factor in UCU leaders’ views and understanding of university-based education as education for civic and moral formation, an education that forms citizens capable of upholding human dignity and justice. In fact, the three dimensions of Jesuit education found in *Characteristics of Jesuit Education* (Kolvenbach, 2005) were clearly present in UCU. These three dimensions include (a) curricula that incorporate justice issues, critical social analysis, and solution scenarios at the age-appropriate level; (b) institutional policies and programs that are to
“give a counter-witness to the values of a consumer society” (Kolvenbach, 2005, para. 79); and (c) active engagement in the works of justice (Kolvenbach, 2005). Further, the Ignatian pastoral circle adopted by Jesuit pedagogy was also evident in the pedagogical approach of UCU leaders. It involves pedagogical process that forms a circle of ongoing movement from experience to reflection to action. The study’s data indicate that three elements of the pastoral approach—experience (contact with injustice), social analysis, and theological reflection integrated with vocational discernment and lifelong application (Bergman, 2011, pp. 27-28)—were evident in the UCU leaders’ views on students’ civic and moral formation, as well as in the curricular and pedagogical dimensions of UCU institutional practice.

**UCU Leaders as Mission-Driven Leaders**

As discussed in Chapter 2, previous research indicates the critical role educational leaders play in establishing an organizational culture and moral climate that is conducive to students’ moral and civic formation (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez, 2005). This study supports earlier research; it indicates a close alignment between UCU leaders’ beliefs and UCU’s institutional practices, policies, and culture. In addition, earlier research suggests that Ukrainian private Christian HEIs are the ones that lead the way in establishing transparent institutional practices and academic processes, show evidence of less corruption, and are more likely to emphasize moral character and democratic values in at least some of their programs and processes (Glanzer & Ream, 2009; Stetar et al., 2005). This study also supports such previous research conclusions.
UCU is a private Christian HEI that, compared to most Ukrainian HEIs, has more transparent institutional practices and academic processes, less corruption, and greater emphasis on student moral formation.

UCU leaders believe that UCU’s mission in Ukrainian society is to be an agent of social transformation by educating a new type of Ukrainian citizenry—moral persons who are active in the country’s young democracy. The goal of UCU leaders is the formation of a new type of person, a citizen who is fully human and capable of leading others in recovering and restoring their humanity, within the context of community. Facilitation of this spiritual and moral transformation from the inside out is part of the mission of a wider Christian church and its institutions within and across denominations (Wallace & Rusk, 2011; Willard, 2002). UCU, as an educational institution of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church is, therefore, an organization whose educational mission should be considered within this broader mission of the Church.

Further, this study supports the previous research discussed in Chapter 2 (Colby et al., 2003; Kohlberg, 1985b; Maldonado et al., 2007; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b), which indicates the importance of schools, as institutions, in facilitating the civic and moral formation of students. The university, guided by its leaders’ vision for a transformed Ukraine where human dignity is upheld, aims to foster the development of moral character and engaged citizenship. UCU case study supports the previous research. Particularly, the CST value of the life and dignity of the human being is the key principle guiding institutional processes and interpersonal interactions within UCU, as well as the university’s relations with the broader community. Inspired in their work by a
philosophical framework rooted in Christian anthropology and CST, UCU leaders aim to transform Ukrainian society by nurturing and educating a new generation of moral leaders.

The reporting by leaders and examination of artifacts indicated that UCU leaders are intentional in applying CST principles in UCU’s institutional context, with a particular emphasis on the CST principle of upholding human dignity. UCU’s transformational mission is its response to the challenges of systemic corruption in Ukraine, as ethical and morally grounded decision-making has dramatically decreased since Ukraine’s independence (Vynoslavska et al., 2005). The university aims to educate moral persons who possess a deep sense of civic responsibility and are actively engaged in society. This finding is consistent with previous research. Earlier studies indicate that the higher a person’s stage of moral reasoning and moral development, the more likely he or she is to actively participate in and facilitate a democratic process (Colby et al., 2003; Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b; Power et al, 1989a, 1989b). Furthermore, individuals who adhere to a code of ethical values are more likely to display ethical decision-making in their professional and business practices (Vynoslavska et al., 2005).

This study supports the previous research that suggests not only that education for democracy requires education for character but also that such education must be an intentional process to succeed (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Kohlberg, 1985b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez; 2005; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). This study indicates that the postsecondary character education process in UCU involves teaching about character through academic
instruction and espoused values; modeling character, in individuals and institutional policies and behavior; setting and enforcing standards for ethical academic practices and behaviors; providing opportunities for practicing character though democratic governance, community service, and experiential learning; and through reflecting on character. UCU aims to fulfill its mission through its institutional practices and institutional policies that uphold integrity and promote justice.

However, an additional critique might be that the leaders did not articulate a clear connection between their philosophical framework and the empirical research on character education and moral development discussed in Chapter 2. It seems that the intentional educational process at UCU could benefit from the empirical research on character education and moral development. As indicated by the findings, UCU leaders are not guided by this research; for example, they do not seem to map learning outcomes in curriculum and co-curricular programs against each stage of moral development. Incorporating research on character education and student development in the planning of integrative education and aligning the learning outcomes with the entire integrated learning process would likely contribute to greater success in their educational mission.

UCU’s institutional environment experienced by students, which they described as free of corruption, is intentionally created by UCU leaders through carefully developed and enforced institutional policies. UCU leadership has some shared characteristics identified in the earlier studies in the cases of leadership of private, Christian higher education institutions in post-Soviet Ukraine (Glanzer & Ream, 2009; Stetar et al., 2005). Similar to the universities in these earlier studies, UCU leaders have established
transparent institutional practices and academic processes; have exhibited an absence of corruption (Glanzer & Ream, 2009) or evidence of less frequency of its occurrence; have emphasized moral character and democratic values in their programs and processes (Stetar et al., 2005); and have a mission to educate young people of moral character and a strong sense civic responsibility (Glanzer & Ream, 2009) to lead Ukraine toward true democracy.

Similar to what is found in the Just Community School approach (Kohlberg, 1981, 1985b; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b), the reporting by leaders and examination of artifacts indicated that UCU’s overall moral climate is the key element to the school-based moral and democratic formation of the young. The moral climate at UCU supports students’ moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action (Lapsley & Narvaez, 2006; Lickona, 1991). In UCU, moral climate is manifested by such elements identified by the previous research as the institution’s culture of collaboration and cooperation; the institution’s sense of identity, mission, vision, and policies; and ethical leadership able to create and maintain a mission-driven, democratic, transformational organization (Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Glanzer & Ream, 2008; Lee, 2008). Earlier studies also identified school moral climate as being instrumental in establishing an institutional climate of integrity and excellence (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2008a, 2008b; Lickona, 1977; Lickona & Davidson, 2008; Narvaez, 2005). The moral climate experienced by students in UCU includes such elements as moral leadership, modeling by leaders, school mission and policies, a strong sense of a caring community (Noddings, 2008), and an atmosphere of care, kindness,
respect, freedom, openness, and trust. It is supported by the ways UCU leaders make it a priority to truly invest in students’ lives. Thus, as also argued earlier by Lickona (1991), the current study indicates that the whole culture of UCU supports the development of good character: of moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral action. This study supports previous research (Berkowitz & Fekula, 1999; Lee, 2008; Narvaez, 2005; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b) regarding whether UCU can promote students’ moral and civic formation by intentionally developing a caring atmosphere, a strong sense of community, a balance between the power dynamics of a truly democratic community and that of democratic governance, and community engagement through service within the school and the broader community.

**UCU Leaders as Moral Exemplars**

UCU leaders view their personal agency and personal example as important factors in students’ moral and civic formation. Similar to the earlier researched U.S. universities that succeed in university-based civic and moral formation (Colby et al., 2003), UCU shares the key contributing institutional element—the role of university leadership in creating an institutional environment conducive to students’ moral and civic formation. Berkowitz (1991) observed that to truly impact students’ moral development, the educational process must involve institutional elements beyond the curriculum. First of all, the CST values are modeled at the level of individual UCU leaders and faculty, as well as on the institutional level (Berkowitz, 1991). In addition, at the institutional level, the moral atmosphere of the school, caring relationships among individuals, and the
overall climate that fosters and requires respect to be an institutional value and policy (Berkowitz, 1991) are also factors impacting moral and character formation.

This study revealed that UCU leaders view their personal agency and personal example as important factors in students’ moral and civic formation. Modeling by faculty and university leaders plays a central role in the ethical formation of students (Berkowitz, 1991; Miles, Lane, Bickel, Walker & Cassel, 1989; Pellegrino, 1989). Teachers model moral behavior in their actions toward their students (Hersh et al., 1980; Lickona, 1977). Ethical leadership plays a critical role in today’s society (Johnson, 2004). Colby and Damon (1994, pp. 18–19) argue that “[t]he course of any society is largely determined by the quality of its moral leadership.” UCU leaders’ belief in the importance of their personal example plays a prominent role in facilitating students’ moral and civic formation. At the institutional level, UCU policies (including the policies on school’s human resources) and practices indicate the intent to demonstrate adherence to the espoused values (Berkowitz, 1991). Starting with an integrated curriculum that incorporates ethics, morality, and values, UCU leaders take an intentional approach to creating an institutional climate and moral environment that would facilitate students’ moral and civic formation.

**UCU’s Institutional Role is Education for Moral Character and Civic Engagement**

UCU leaders believe that UCU’s institutional role is to educate students for moral character and civic engagement through a holistic, integrated, and developmentally appropriate process. Echoing the aforementioned research by Colby et al. (2003), Kohlberg (1985a), Maldonado et al. (2007), and Power et al. (1989b), UCU leaders
believe that universities have the capacity to facilitate the civic and moral formation of students. Further, this study findings support the earlier research on moral development and character education discussed in Chapter 2 in that UCU leaders aim to educate moral and ethical persons in UCU by intentionally structuring educational processes and programs around this goal (Maldonado et al., 2007) and to foster moral and civic formation by promoting moral feeling, moral knowing, and a life of moral action (Lickona, 1991).

Berkowitz (1991) outlined a pedagogical formula for undergraduate moral education, addressing three domains: moral values, moral reasoning, and moral character. At UCU, as this study suggests, the pedagogical practice of character education aims to have “impact on students’ moral values in a systematic and productive fashion” (Berkowitz, 1991, p. 117). Further, to be effective, moral and civic learning in UCU is intentionally designed as an integrated process across the academic curriculum, as well as in extracurricular programming (Colby et al., 2003). UCU leaders strive to intentionally create an integrated learning process by providing opportunities for alternative meaning-making through the spiritual dimension in UCU’s educational process, and incorporating issues of ethics, morality, and values into the undergraduate curriculum. As this study suggests, UCU leaders and faculty facilitate reflection on diverse perspectives, create an environment that allows students to explore and challenge different values, assist students in forming valuing skills, and increase students’ capacity for moral judgment (Berkowitz, 1991). Moral reasoning is promoted through peer discussion and debate of moral
dilemmas and dialogue on different value positions (Berkowitz, 1991; Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b).

Furthermore, UCU strives to create an institutional environment that promotes moral action and prepares its students for a life of commitment to justice, service, and civic engagement (Kohlberg, 1985a, 1985b; Power et al., 1989a, 1989b). UCU aims to achieve this goal by creating opportunities for students to take on leadership roles through extracurricular involvement and service opportunities, by altering normal institutional practices to allow students to take part in timely civil action, by being examples of advocacy for justice and service to the local community and Ukraine, and by allowing and encouraging UCU alumni to continue their involvement with UCU through community activism. Although these practices do not eliminate students’ postgraduation moral challenges and occasional failures, leaders are nonetheless confident that, overall, UCU’s institutional policies and practices foster moral character and engaged citizenship.

UCU leaders view the formation of the whole person to be the goal of the educational process. They explained that their aim was to prepare students who not only excel academically, but also are capable of living principled lives of ethics, morals, and personal integrity. Furthermore, the data indicate that UCU leaders believe university should be the place that facilitates moral formation. This study suggests that educational process in UCU bears qualities identified in the earlier studies as needed to facilitate the developmentally appropriate moral and civic formation of an individual. It also suggests the characteristics of the organizational environment needed within educational institutions in order to facilitate such a process of moral and civic formation. UCU
leaders take a deliberative approach to the development of autonomy and formation of postconventional levels of moral judgment (Narvaez, 2005). In addition, the study suggests that UCU leaders place a strong emphasis on the development of a strong community within UCU. Experiences of students interviewed for this study indicate attachment to the school community, a key element in the development of autonomy. Although community attachment and positive relationships are important qualities of the positive moral atmosphere of UCU described earlier, the pedagogical implication is that democratic community within UCU and caring relationships within the community are strong predictors of the moral and civic formation of adolescents (Power et al., 1989a).

Finally, at UCU, service is viewed as a way of learning and as a building block of civic formation, for UCU leaders emphasized that learning does not stop in the classroom. Previous research suggests not only that youth with more developed moral attitudes and moral judgment tend to be more active in their civic participation, but that youth participation in volunteer service is a predictor of their developing higher stages of moral reasoning and moral attitudes (Batchelder & Root, 1994; Boss, 1994; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Franz & McClelland, 1994; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Hart et al., 2006; Leming, 2001; Nassi, 1981). According to Hart et al. (2008), moral identity formation seems to increase when opportunities for moral action are provided. The findings of this study indicate that UCU offers many opportunities for service and that even after graduation many UCU alumni continue their involvement in service and activism, as they maintain their ties to the UCU community. Among other things, they identify and organize programs and services to address the needs of the local community. Further,
UCU commitment to service is university-wide, and faculty, leaders, students, and alumni inspire by their example “charitable, selfless, cultural and moral enrichment of [Ukrainian] society” (from interview with a 4th-year male student). This commitment to moral enrichment and transformation of Ukrainian society brings me to the role of the UCU community in the recent events of Ukraine’s 2013–2014 Dignity Revolution and in the pressing, post-revolution task of national anticorruption reforms.

UCU and Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity

The voices of UCU leaders have become very close to me, so when the peaceful Maidan (translated as square and referring to Independence Square in downtown Kyiv) protests began in November of 2013 (Kruk, 2014), I easily recognized those voices in the message of dignity that UCU rector delivered from the Maidan main stage in Kyiv Independence Square. Last winter, there was a very distinct moment when the message of Maidan changed from the theme of East versus West, which was imposed by the media, to the pro-Dignity theme. Through this message, Ukraine’s revolution from fall 2013 to spring 2014 has become known as The Revolution of Dignity. However, these words were first used by the UCU rector on the Maidan stage, when he emphasized that Ukraine’s people rose up and stood up for their dignity. While I was completing my findings chapter, UCU leaders, faculty, and students were actively participating in the revolution. Leaders and priests of Ukrainian churches, including the Greek Catholic church, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church Kyiv Patriarchy, and other Christian denominations, were spreading the message of dignity through their daily work in
Maidan volunteer kitchens, Maidan Open University, emergency operating rooms set up in churches, shelters, food delivery, and cooking.

The interesting fact, not covered by the Western media, is that the first protests in response to President Yanukovich’s decision to reverse Ukraine’s course toward EU membership broke out in the streets of Lviv, the home of UCU, and only several days later did peaceful demonstrations in Kyiv follow. Furthermore, I learned by following the live updates on the revolution in the social media feeds of Ukrainian online newspapers and media sources that among the very first Lviv demonstrators protesting the anti-European (and antidemocratic) course of Ukraine were faculty, students, and leaders of UCU. Students held hand-made signs that said “Kyivans, come out to Maidan!” (Euromaidanlviv, 2013). Later, UCU students, leaders, and faculty were among the first peaceful Maidan protesters. One of the faculty members, Bohdan Solchanyk, was later shot (Bilocerkowycz, 2014) during the violent government suppression of the unarmed protesters.

As the protests continued for several months in the midst of winter and government brutality and as the message of dignity filled the minds and hearts of people in Ukraine and beyond, I wondered whether the world was witnessing UCU’s mission bearing its first fruit and whether its commitment to Ukraine’s national transformation through educating moral and active citizens had, in fact, produced the critical mass of Ukraine’s democratic change agents—the moral elite. Moving on to the discussion of this study’s implications for future research and its applications, I cannot but wonder whether
this question, which I was initially considering for my future research, has already been answered by these recent, historic events.

**Implications for Future Research and Practice**

The emerging understanding of the UCU leaders’ beliefs and views provides an insight into the possible direction of Ukraine’s higher education reform, particularly pertaining to institutional-level policies and processes. It also provides an insight into the possible ways to structure university-based education of undergraduate students at a university level. Further, the study findings inform future large-scale studies of university leadership as it pertains to university-based civic and moral formation in Ukraine and other former Soviet countries pursuing a democratic future. Finally, the findings offer insights for crafting international policy and programs that aim to promote democratic development in the post-Soviet space through higher education.

Insights gained from this research contribute to a greater understanding of the relationship between a Christian faith-informed, CST-inspired, and mission-driven leadership and education for democracy. The current study suggests such a relationship exists in the context of Ukraine and UCU. However, the study raises a number of questions in the areas of cultural anthropology, pedagogy and education, and leadership studies. Exploring the role of the UCU community in shaping the pro-dignity and pro-democracy stand of Ukraine’s leading intellectuals and human rights activists, as well as the role of UCU leaders, faculty, and students in the events of the Dignity Revolution and post-revolution, will inform understanding of the role that religious values and mission-driven leadership play in shaping bottom-up, grassroots democratic processes and
national transformation in Ukraine. Furthermore, the interplay of religious values, mission-driven leadership, and social change may be explored in the context of various post-Soviet nations.

Another direction for future research is to study perspectives of leaders in all Ukrainian higher education institutions on student civic and moral formation. The insights from this study may inform the development of large-scale survey research, which may inform the direction of Ukraine’s higher education reforms in such areas as professional development and training of university leaders, organizational development in higher education, curricular and co-curricular integration, and pedagogy of undergraduate education for civic and moral formation. Furthermore, an in-depth comparative study of pedagogical dimensions of character education based on the empirical research and Ignatian pedagogy, particularly with the focus on student learning, would inform the development of pedagogical practices and evaluation methods of college students’ moral and civic formation.

It would also be reasonable to explore a question of whether the ethos of UCU would change if the school’s student population were to grow further. At the time of the study, 452 students were enrolled in Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree programs at UCU in the university’s two schools (UCU, 2012). By 2014, the number of students enrolled at UCU grew to 716 (UCU, 2014). As the current study suggests, the positive moral climate in UCU is the result of its leaders’ direct involvement in UCU’s daily life. However, with growth, the institution may face a challenge of sustaining its culture and moral climate.
Further, a question arises as to whether the university’s culture would remain the same or become more bureaucratic as UCU ages.

This research has implications for educators and leaders of universities and colleges aiming to prepare students as globally engaged citizens. The current study supports previous research conclusions that moral and character education should go hand in hand with education for active citizenship. Integrative education, experiential and service learning pedagogy within the context of positive institutional moral climate, mission-driven leadership, and modeling by university leaders, faculty, and staff are elements of a comprehensive organizational and educational framework for the university-based formation of students as ethical and active citizens. Even if university curriculum and co-curricular programs do not have a formal focus on engaged citizenship, students are educated through the institutional culture and moral climate. Further research may involve a study of institutional culture and moral climate in universities, and examination of the role of leaders in creating HEIs that are capable of educating moral and engaged citizens in Ukraine and beyond. Keeping this in mind, another area for future research, relevant to international development policy-making, is to explore the extent to which international democracy funding programs incorporate the aforementioned elements of institutional framework in the development and evaluation of youth, social, and educational programs.

Finally, another area for future research is to examine the elements of higher education leadership for moral and civic formation in relation to the mission-driven model of leadership and leader self-differentiation (Bowen, 1978). Previous research in
the field of mission-driven leadership (Cardona & Rey, 2008) was conducted by scholars of management and business. Insights from this study may lead to interdisciplinary inquiry, through the integration of the present study’s theoretical framework, leadership theories, and Bowen systems theory, to examine higher education leadership for moral and civic formation. Such examination may lead to extrapolating specific leadership elements necessary for creating HEIs that are successful in educating students for moral character and engaged citizenship.

Conclusion

This qualitative single-case study was informed by theories of moral and character education. It explored Ukrainian Catholic University leaders’ beliefs and views about university-based student moral and civic formation and the ways their beliefs and views informed the university’s organizational mission and practices within the context of Ukraine’s post-Soviet democratic transition. The literature suggested that moral climate consists of inspiring organizational mission and values; supportive and engaged community; leaders, faculty, and staff who are strong role models; and university policies as well as educational and community practices that promote moral character formation: moral feeling, moral knowing, and moral action. According to the 17 participants interviewed in this study and to the documents and artifacts, UCU leaders are role models of moral leadership and change agency, who, inspired by Christian anthropology and CST, aim to educate a new generation of Ukraine’s leaders distinguished by moral character and commitment to social justice and active citizenship. While themes varied as to individual professional fields and academic backgrounds, the underlying conclusion of
the data in this research study is that moral and mission-driven leadership is needed to inspire a HEI and to create an organizational culture and climate that facilitate the development of moral character and civic responsibility and engagement.

Chapter 5 concludes this research study. The study produced four key findings that revealed UCU leaders’ beliefs and their implications for UCU institutional mission, organizational practices, and community life within the university: (a) Catholic Social Teaching as educational philosophy, (b) UCU leaders as moral exemplars; (c) UCU leaders as mission-driven leaders, and (d) UCU’s institutional role to educate students for moral character and civic engagement through a holistic, integrated, and developmentally appropriate process.

This discussion offers a recommendation to utilize moral development and character education framework in Ukraine’s higher education reforms. This chapter identifies areas for future interdisciplinary research, including study of higher education leadership in Ukraine, other post-Soviet states, and beyond from the perspective of the relationship between engaged citizenship learning outcomes and organizational culture. It also suggests exploring higher education leadership through the lens of mission-driven leadership and leaders’ self-differentiation. The final recommendation is to conduct an in-depth study of pedagogical practices of university-based education for engaged citizenship by integrating theories of moral and character education, student development, and integrative and service learning.
Final Thoughts

This dissertation has contributed to the literature on leadership and education for moral character and civic engagement by incorporating the UCU leaders’ views and beliefs on university-based moral and civic formation. More importantly, the study demystified the importance of moral values-based and mission-driven higher education for the democratic future of Ukraine. The study suggests that the most important CST concept of upholding human dignity is a key value that underlines the university’s mission, educational practices, organizational systems, and advocacy role in Ukrainian society. As UCU leaders aim to educate a new generation of Ukraine’s moral leaders, they do not appear to be guided by empirical research on moral and character education. Their theoretical framework is rooted in CST, and their pedagogical approach can be traced to Ignatian pedagogy.

As a concluding thought, UCU’s stand for eradicating corruption and building democracy in Ukraine led to some historical developments in Ukraine. UCU’s community ignited the first peaceful protests in Lviv that led to the events of the peaceful resistance of the Dignity Revolution, and the message of dignity articulated by UCU leaders in the Maidan protests has now given the name to the revolution. Since the revolution, UCU leaders have played an even larger role than before in anticorruption reforms in higher education and have continued the dialogue about reforms within the higher education community. Finally, as I read through my social media feeds (Lvivska Osvitna Fundacia, 2014; UCU Volunteer Hundred, 2015) of Ukrainian news sources I followed during the revolution in order to stay informed, I learned that UCU graduates
have played a major role in defending Ukraine in the undeclared war Russia has waged since spring 2014. They have organized drives of medical supplies, clothing, and funding for military, wounded, and displaced people; run volunteer organizations that help local populations in the conflict zone; and offer healing and hope. This study suggests that, because of its leadership, UCU has been a decisive and perhaps historic voice for dignity and justice in Ukraine.
Appendix A

Historic Background of Moral Education in Ukraine

Because this study deals with Ukrainian leaders’ views, which are particular to Ukraine and unique in the world, this Appendix highlights the historic centrality of character education and civic formation in Soviet and Ukrainian K-16 education. A very young democracy, Ukraine became an independent state in 1991, after centuries of domination by Poland-Lithuania, the Ottoman and Russian Empires, and, most recently, the Soviet Union. Prior to the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, traditionally, family and church were the institutions responsible for moral and character education of Ukrainian people. Pre-Soviet moral education in Ukraine was values-based and rooted in Christian religious tradition. Such Christian virtues as faith in God, devotion to His volition, love of one’s fellow humans, humility, honesty, and respect for parents and seniors (Kontsigir, 2000) were central to character education of that era. The following is an overview of the Soviet system of character education. In Ukrainian sources, the morality of persons is linked to the nation’s ability to transition to democratic society (Chorna, 2001). In the Ukrainian system of education, the following definition of moral education can be found in the pedagogical dictionary of S. Goncharenko: “Moral education is one of the most important forms of education. Its goal is the intentional formation of moral conscience,
the development of moral feelings, and the formation of moral habits and of moral
behavioral traits in accordance with a certain ideology” (Fedeka, 2007, p. 136).

**Moral Education in the Soviet Union**

During the 70 year-long period of Soviet rule, the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union emphasized education for a moral person ready to fight for the pursuit of “bright
Communist future” (Dmitriyev, 1997, p.6) and to uphold the ideas of communism. The
government mandated that the Soviet school system cultivate the young generation to be
well rooted in the communist ideology. Similarly to all Soviet republics, moral education
in Ukraine was centralized and controlled by the state (Sidorovitch, 2005).

Soviet educators developed a comprehensive system of moral education (referred
as vospitaniye and more precisely translated as upbringing or character/social education)
(Glanzer, 2005, p. 207). It played a central role in the communist values-based character
formation process and was a key component in the Soviet school curriculum (Misco &
Hamot, 2007, p. 51). The emphasis was placed on such humanistic moral values as
collectivism, cooperation, mutual assistance, service, goodwill, honesty, simplicity,
modesty, and respect for others. The Soviet system of education also stressed patriotism,
atheism, and love of labor (Sidorovitch, 2005, p. 484; Glanzer, 2005, p. 207) and
encouraged young people to live according the highest standards of morality so that their
lives would not compromise the communist ideals (Kontsigir, 2000, p. 23). Moral
education was implemented through formal classroom teaching, after-school activities,
and school-based community (vospitatelnaya) work with students (through school-based
youth divisions of communist organizations: oktyabryata in elementary school, pionery in middle school, and komsomol in high school and beyond) in the form of service, cultural, political, and other projects.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the emergence of Ukraine as an independent democratic state, the nation was faced with a sudden moral vacuum (Petrenko & Glanzer, 2005). While communist values and ideals were rejected and its educational methodology was criticized, the old structures and much of the content and teaching methods (since teachers were trained under the old system) remained the same. The transition to democracy called for the development of a new national educational policy in Ukraine and a new perspective on moral education.

Moral Education and the Nation-Building Process in Ukraine After 1991

Having emerged as a fully independent nation for the first time in its history (a very brief period of Ukraine’s independence between 1918 and 1920 was followed by the Soviet occupation), Ukraine today is struggling to establish its distinction from Russian national identity “to gain acceptance for [its] cultural heritage” (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007, pp. 528, 536). At the same time, the transition to democracy and a market economy is filled with moral decline, rampant corruption, out-of-control criminal activity, and extreme socioeconomic disparities (Kalman, 2004). Faced with the need to assert its nation’s independence in the prevalent culture of corruption in the society that is just being introduced to the democratic principle of the rule of law, the government of Ukraine pins hopes for nation-building and the establishment of moral society on its educational system.
The first government of the independent Ukraine “took up the twin tasks of nation-building and educational reform. In 1994, it laid down its vision in the *State National Programme ‘Education’ (Ukraine of the twenty-first century)*, a strategic policy document prepared by a group of scientists and teachers” (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007, p. 533). The document called for the democratization of the educational process and for the development of education based on Ukrainian national origins and traditions. The program saw the formation of personal values and the development of “national consciousness and education in national traditions as closely related” processes. (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007, p. 534). It has tasked the Ukrainian system of public education with the cultivation of national identity grounded in its history and culture (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007).
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Preset Analytical Categories from Previous Research

1. Definitions

Process of moral formation

- Formation of moral values
- Moral reasoning
- Moral character

Moral education

- Moral education includes preparation for work and citizenship roles as well as the role of a private individual (Liddell, 2006).
- Moral education defined; moral education is concerned with teaching justice.

2. Developmental Appropriateness

- Importance of late adolescence stage of development in moral and civic formation;
- Importance of deliberative education focused on development of autonomy and formation of post-conventional levels of moral judgment;
- Role of adults is critical to autonomy development;
- Caring and cooperative relationships, exposure to prosocial values and understanding others, opportunities for interaction with peers and for prosocial action, utilization of
moral discussion and of developmental discipline in developing students’ moral reasoning and moral habits (Watson et. al., 1989).

- Non-indoctrinative nature

3. Process of Fostering Moral and Civic Formation of University Students

- Attachment to community that models and offers opportunities for direct democratic participation.
  - Educators create environment that allows students and adults become active participants in a democratically functioning community.
  - Students make decisions about real life dilemmas and actions, ones they have to make for the school’s survival as a community.
  - Students are confronted by teachers and peers about discrepancies between their public judgments and reasoning and their actual action.
  - Educational process that facilitates democratic formation of students.
  - Students make decisions about real life dilemmas and actions, ones they have to make for the school’s survival as a community.
  - Confronted by teachers and peers about discrepancies between their public judgments and reasoning and their actual action.
  - Community engagement through service.

- Moral atmosphere of the school.

- Modeling by teachers and school administrators.
• Undergraduate moral and character education intentionally designed as an integrated process across academic curriculum, as well as in extracurricular programming.

• Undergraduate moral and character education incorporates ethics, morality, and values more pervasively into the undergraduate curriculum.

• Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral values:
  o academic instruction;
  o espoused values;
  o modeling character as individuals;
  o institutional policies and behavior; and
  o setting and enforcing standards for ethical academic practices and behaviors.

• Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral reasoning:
  o reflection;
  o peer discussion of moral dilemmas; and
  o dialogue on varying values positions.

• Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral character:
  o faculty members being advocates for justice and not only facilitators;
  o providing opportunities for practicing character though:
    ▪ democratic governance;
    ▪ community service;
    ▪ experiential learning; and
reflecting on character.

- Institutional decisions beyond curriculum support student moral development:
  - university human resources;
  - governance structure;
  - institutional policies; and
  - institutional values positions.

- Undergraduate moral and character education intentionally designed as an integrated process across academic curriculum, as well as in extracurricular programming.

- Undergraduate moral and character education incorporates ethics, morality, and values more pervasively into the undergraduate curriculum.

- Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral values:
  - academic instruction;
  - espoused values;
  - modeling character as individuals;
  - institutional policies and behavior; and
  - setting and enforcing standards for ethical academic practices and behaviors.

- Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral reasoning:
  - reflection;
  - peer discussion of moral dilemmas; and
  - dialogue on varying values positions.

- Undergraduate moral and character education addresses moral character:
• faculty members being advocates for justice and not only facilitators;

• providing opportunities for practicing character through:
  ▪ democratic governance;
  ▪ community service;
  ▪ experiential learning; and
  ▪ reflection on character.

• Undergraduate moral and character education address institutional decisions beyond curriculum:
  
  o university human resources
    ▪ selection and training of faculty who are concerned with the development of students.

  o government structure
    ▪ systematically structures its forms of governance to better support student moral development.

  o institution’s policies
    ▪ the moral atmosphere of an institution can facilitate or inhibit the moral growth of its members.

  o institutional values positions
    ▪ the university needs to clearly state its mission and value stances and it needs to act accordingly;
    ▪ at all times welcome and encourage debate of exactly those positions;
such an environment encourages not only academic freedom but also “integrity and moral formation” (Berkowitz, 1991, pp. 119-120).
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Participant Recruitment Telephone Script

Hello, ________.

My name is Svetlana Filiatreau. I am calling to personally invite you to participate in a research study that looks at students’ moral and civic formation that takes you through formal and informal processes within UCU. I have asked Mr. ABC to relate to you my interest in learning about your views and perceptions, and I am thankful for your openness to consider participation in this study.

Let me tell you a little about myself, so that you have some idea about my background. I lived and completed my university education in Ukraine. However, I have never taken a position as a faculty or administrator at a Ukrainian postsecondary institution and only experienced Soviet era university-based practices in students’ character and civic formation. I need your expert opinion as someone who has worked in Ukraine’s postsecondary education for a number of years and who is familiar with the process of student moral and civic formation in Ukrainian HEIs.

If you agree to participate in this study, you and I will choose a time, for when I can call you (either on Skype or by telephone) to ask you some questions about the students’ moral and civic formation at UCU. The interview should not take more than an
hour, but I may need to call you back later if I need you to clarify or elaborate some of your answers.

I will also e-mail to you a letter that describes what your participation will entail. Please read it and feel free to ask any questions. When I call you at the time we schedule for the interview, I will first read to you the contents of this letter and then I will ask you, whether you agree to participate in this study. At that time, I will ask you (for the record) whether you agree (or disagree) to participate in this research. I will audio record your response and it will be kept on file at George Mason University to ensure that I, as a researcher follow ethical standards for conducting research.

Do you prefer a call on Skype or by telephone? If Skype is your preference, what is your Skype ID? I will need to add it to my account first in order to be able to call you. If you prefer telephone what is the best number to reach you? What time and date would work for you better? Let’s keep in mind that you are seven hours ahead of me.

I am putting this time in my calendar. If for some reason (sickness, emergency) I cannot reach you at work/home at the time we are scheduling this interview for, what would be the best back up date, time and telephone number to use?

Thank you very much, Mr. EFG. I look forward to speaking with you on . . .
Appendix D

Unstructured Interview Guide for National Policy Context Specific Interviews

- Historically, during the Soviet era, Ukrainian HEIs were tasked with students’ character and civic formation for active participation in the Soviet society. What has changed with the way process of moral and civic formation is conducted today within the system of higher education in Ukraine?
- What are Ukraine’s current educational policies contain academic standards for character (including moral) education and civic formation?
- How are these standards being interpreted by the university leaders? Are there guidelines and recommendations (or directives) that leaders receive from the Ministry of Education to assist with interpretation and implementation of character and civic education?
- In recent years, I came across headlines in Ukrainian media that indicate national leadership’s concern with moral decline of young generation. How do these concerns translate into character education policies? What is involved in research and coordination of policy development and implementation within the structures of Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Verhovna Rada, and Ministry of Education?
• From what you know about character education research and policy development in Ukraine, what elements are necessary to facilitate successful university-based students’ formation as moral and civically responsible member of today’s Ukrainian society?

• What role, do you think, do university leaders (rectors and administrators of various levels) play in moral and civic formation of university students?

• What role do current higher education policies play in facilitating university leaders’ commitment (or lack of it) to students’ moral and civic formation?

• From what you know about the policy context, in what ways does situation with university-based character and civic formation in non-state, independent, HEIs differ from the state-run colleges and universities?

• Do you know of and can you give me any examples of higher education institutions in Ukraine (state-run, as well as non-state), where leaders intentionally developed a series of internal policies and processes that on the one hand emphasize organizational transparency, ethics and excellence, and, on the other hand, also place priority on quality of students professional, as well as moral and civic formation?
Appendix E

Semi-structured Interview Guide

(Pertaining to the First Unit of Analysis, Leaders’ Views of University-Based Moral and Civic Formation)

In the recent webcast interviews at the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation in Washington, DC, both UCU’s rector, Father Gudziak, and vice rector Marynovych, mentioned that moral nature of today’s problems with democratic reforms in Ukraine and that UCU tries to approach today’s crisis by addressing the moral root of these problems. Many of my questions will be aimed at trying to understand what you and UCU leadership as a whole mean by this and what actions you actually take to make this happen through education of students and engagement with the broader community.

1. Would you please tell me more about what you mean by “moral nature” of Ukraine’s today’s societal problems?

2. How does this belief of moral nature of societal problems inform what you personally do in your leadership position at UCU?

3. In what ways does this belief system inform what you advocate for and do in the area of students’ moral and civic formation?
4. How would you define moral and civic formation? How would you describe the ideal process of university-based students’ moral and civic formation?

5. What do you think is the role of UCU’s organizational moral climate in moral and civic formation of undergraduate students?

6. What about UCU’s institutional policies and practices? What part do you think they play in moral and ethical formation of students?

7. How do you view the role your own leadership philosophy and practice play in facilitating moral and civic formation of students?


1. What actions have UCU leadership taken at the university level to facilitate students’ moral and civic formation?

2. What are the elements in UCU’s academic framework aimed at facilitating students’ moral and character formation?

3. In what ways do you/university leaders develop internal system of organizational and academic policies that contribute to students’ moral and civic formation?

4. What are curricular and co-curricular elements that, in your mind, facilitative students’ moral and civic formation within UCU?

5. Please describe some elements of moral climate within UCU that, in your opinion, contribute to students’ moral and civic formation within UCU? What
are some ways, in which you/UCU leaders contribute to development of such institutional climate?

6. In what ways do you think institutional policies and practices contribute to students’ moral and civic formation?

7. In your opinion, in what role do UCU leaders’ own values, character, and actions play in students’ moral and civic formation within UCU?

8. To what extent does current national sociopolitical context in Ukraine (including educational policy environment) inform your/the leaders’ views and actions in the area of students’ moral and civic formation?

UCU Character Education framework (Adapted from the Eleven Principles Survey).

In the next set of questions, I will ask you about the specifics of UCU’s character education. Please, base your answers on what you personally know from your observations and experience. Do you agree or disagree with these statements? Please, elaborate.

CHARACTER EDUCATION PROMOTES AND TEACHES QUALITIES OF GOOD CHARACTER, SUCH AS PRUDENCE (GOOD JUDGMENT), RESPECT, RESPONSIBILITY, HONESTY, FAIRNESS, COURTESY, KINDNESS, COURAGE, DILIGENCE.

_____ 1. Our school leaders, administrators and faculty have agreed on character traits we wish to promote in our character education program.

_____ 2. We have defined these character traits in terms of behaviors that can be observed in the school, family, and community.

_____ 3. We have made these character traits and their behavioral definitions widely known throughout our school and parent community.

CHARACTER IS DEFINED COMPREHENSIVELY TO INCLUDE THINKING, FEELING, AND BEHAVIOR.

_____ 4. We take deliberate steps to help students acquire a developmentally appropriate understanding of what the character traits mean in everyday behavior and to grasp the reasons why some behaviors are right and others wrong.
5. We take deliberate steps to help students admire the character traits, desire to possess them, and become committed to them.

6. We take deliberate steps to help students practice the character traits so that they become habits.

CHARACTER EDUCATION IS INTENTIONAL, PROACTIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE.

7. Character education is intentional and proactive; it provides regular, planned, and explicit opportunities for students to learn the qualities of good character.

8. Our program is comprehensive across the curriculum; the character traits are regularly integrated into instruction in all subjects at the undergraduate level.

9. Our character education program is infused throughout the school day. The character traits are upheld by the university faculty and staff, and taken seriously by students throughout the school environment: in the classrooms, corridors, cafeterias, assemblies, and extracurricular activities, and in the gyms, athletic fields, and during the school events and community projects.

10. Our drug, alcohol, and sex education programs are character-based, consistent with the school’s highest character expectations of respect, responsibility, and self-control and actively guiding students toward abstinence from drugs, alcohol, and sexual activity.

THE SCHOOL IS A CARING COMMUNITY

11. Our program makes it a high priority to foster attachments between faculty, staff and students. The school schedule, for example, is designed to minimize disruption
and stress and to maximize staff time for developing supportive relationships with students.

_____ 12. Our school makes it a high priority to help students from caring attachments to each other, including caring attachments between older and younger students.

_____ 13. Our school does not tolerate peer cruelty (persecution, exclusion and the like) and takes steps to prevent cruelty and deal with it effectively when it occurs.

UCU STUDENTS HAVE FREQUENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MORAL ACTION

_____ 14. Our program provides students with repeated and varied opportunities for moral action such as cooperative learning, conflict resolution, student government, class problem-solving meetings, school and community service, and taking personal responsibility for improving one’s behavior and learning.

_____ 15. Our program helps students consciously take responsibility for developing their own character - for example, by encouraging students to set daily goals to practice the character traits and to assess and record their success in achieving their goals.

CHARACTER EDUCATION INCLUDES AN ACADEMIC CURRICULUM THAT BUILDS GOOD CHARACTER

_____ 16. Our academic curriculum is designed to challenge all students to do their personal best and to develop the qualities of character—such as self-discipline, diligence, perseverance, and a concern for excellence—that support personal responsibility and a strong work ethic.

_____ 17. Our school respects the way students learn by providing active learning experiences such as problem-solving, cooperative learning, and projects that build on
students’ interests.

18. Our curriculum recognizes multiple intelligences and helps students of diverse abilities and needs discover and develop their special talents.

CHARACTER EDUCATION STRIVES TO DEVELOP THE INTRINSIC MOTIVATION CENTRAL TO GOOD CHARACTER.

19. Our program’s approach to classroom and school discipline is centered on developing students’ intrinsic commitment to doing what's right—following legitimate rules, for example, because doing so respects the rights and needs of self and others. Logical consequences for wrongdoing are administered in such a way as to strengthen a student’s inner character resources: moral reasoning, self-control, and strategies for responsible behavior in the future. Students are also taught to take initiative to make active restitution when they do something wrong.

20. When we deal with discipline problems, we make explicit reference to the character qualities we are trying to teach—with the goal of helping students use standards such as courtesy, kindness, honesty, fairness, and self-control to evaluate and improve their conduct.

21. In our classrooms and school, we recognize and celebrate good character in ways that support rather than undermine intrinsic motivation (by keeping the focus on doing good things because it helps others and oneself); recognition for good character is accessible to all who are deserving and not limited just to a few.
THE ENTIRE SCHOOL STAFF SHARES RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHARACTER EDUCATION AND LIVES BY THE SCHOOL’S CHARACTER EXPECTATIONS.

_____ 22. All professional school staff (including administrators, counselors, librarians, coaches, and teaching faculty) have been included in planning, receiving staff development for, and carrying out the schoolwide character education effort.

_____ 23. All other staff (including secretaries, cafeteria workers, bus drivers, playground aides, etc.) have been included in planning, receiving staff development for, and carrying out the school wide character education effort.

_____ 24. The character traits espoused by our school are modeled by staff in their interactions with students.

_____ 25. The character traits espoused by our school are practiced by staff in their interactions with each other; there is a moral community among adults—including relations between administration and faculty—that is governed by norms of mutual respect, fairness, and collaborative decision-making.

_____ 26. Regular and adequate time is made available for staff planning and reflection: to design the character education program, share success stories, assess progress, and address moral concerns, especially gaps between the school's professed character expectations and observed behavior in the school.

CHARACTER EDUCATION INVOLVES MORAL LEADERSHIP BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.

_____ 27. Our program has a leader (the principal, another administrator, a lead faculty
member) who champions our character education effort.

28. There is a leadership group (a committee, a task force) that guides the ongoing planning and implementation of our character education program and encourages the involvement of the whole school.

29. Students are involved in leadership roles (e.g., through student government, special councils, and peer mediation) in ways that develop their responsibility and help the school's character expectations become part of the peer culture.

THE SCHOOL RECRUITS STUDENTS’ FAMILIES AND THE COMMUNITY AS FULL PARTNERS IN CHARACTER EDUCATION.

30. Our program explicitly affirms that parents are the first and most important character educators of their children. Parents’ questions and concerns about any part of our character program are taken seriously; every effort is made to respect parents’ rights as their child’s primary moral teacher.

31. Parents and community members are included in our school’s character education leadership group.

32. All parents are informed about the goals and teaching methods of our character education program.

33. Our school has involved representatives of the wider community (e.g., businesses, religious institutions, youth organizations, government, and the media) in helping to plan our character education effort.

34. Our school has involved members of the community in efforts to model and promote the qualities of good character in the community.

____ 35. Our program assesses the character of our school as a moral community (e.g., through school climate surveys using agree/disagree items such as, “Students in our school respect each other” and “Our school is like a family”).

____ 36. Our staff periodically engages in systematic formative assessment of our program, using surveys such as this to determine the degree to which we are implementing the intended components of our character education program. The results of these assessments are used to plan program improvements.

____ 37. Our school asks staff to report periodically (e.g., through questionnaires or anecdotal records) their efforts to implement character education.

____ 38. We assess our students’ progress in developing an understanding of the character traits—for example, by asking them to define the traits, recognize or produce examples of the traits in action, and explain how these traits help them and others.

____ 39. We assess our students’ progress in developing an emotional attachment and commitment to the qualities of good character—for example, by asking students to rate how important the character traits are to them in their lives.

____ 40. We assess our students’ progress in behaving in ways that reflect the character traits—for example, by collecting data on observable character-related behaviors, such as school attendance, acts of honesty, volunteering for school or community service, discipline referrals, fighting, vandalism, drug incidents, and student pregnancies, and by
asking students to complete anonymous self-report questionnaires on character-related behaviors (e.g., *How many times during the past week have you helped someone who is not a friend or family member?*, *How many times have you cheated on a test or major assignment in the past year?*, and *How many times in the past month have you stood up for what was right—for example, by resisting peer pressure to do something wrong or by defending a schoolmate against unfair gossip?*).

41. We include assessment of student character or character-related behaviors as part of our student progress evaluation.
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Sample Memo Output in Dedoose Interface
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Sample of Code Applications in Dedoose
Appendix H

Sample Dedoose Output: Views and Theological Themes
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Appendix J
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Sample Dedoose Output of Leader Interview Codes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>AJ</th>
<th>AK</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AN</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AQ</th>
<th>AR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Red:** Important Virtues
- **Green:** Leadership
- **Blue:** University Programs
- **Yellow:** Social Solidarity
- **Orange:** Rights Education
- **White:** Life Transformation
- **Pink:** Education Goals

**Note:**
- The numbers in the cells represent the priority or frequency of each category.
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UCU Provost’s Journey to Starting UCU

Excerpt from telephone interview with UCU rector, English translation, April 19, 2011.

I began considering ministry and seminary when I was approximately 15. And after 4-5 years passed by, I went. So this was a slow process, and countercultural, as my father was against it and so was my surrounding environment. My friends and acquaintances absolutely did not understand this, and this was something intimate and personal. The fact that I went to Rome was connected with my acquaintance with Josyf Slipyj. At the time he was in Rome, but in 1968 when I was seven years old, he came to Syracuse, and I was selected—along with another student, a girl who knew Ukrainian—to greet him at the airport. And later, when I was around 14, I traveled to Rome with my parents. As a matter of fact, in Rome, Josyf Slipyj established a prototype of Ukrainian Catholic University. It was in 1975, when I was still a secondary school student— and that was another time I saw him in America, in 1976. . . . And for me this sense of calling to ministry was interconnected with his example. That’s why after graduating from university I went to Rome . . . and set up life in Rome, as we were students in Italian universities simultaneously while enrolled as students at Ukrainian Catholic University. In 1980, upon my arrival, there were 11 of us students, but we lived under the same one
roof with Josyf Slipyj. And he, with his person and personality opened for us—despite the fact that we were Americans, Europeans, or Australians—a perspective on Ukraine.

He was a scholar of UCU. UCU was the apple of his eye. He made UCU his greatest priority. . . . At the age of 63, he was exiled from the Soviet Union. They let him go. It was February when he arrived in Rome, and by November he declared in Rome the establishment of the university, so it was only eight or nine months after 18 years of labor camps and exile. He began to implement the idea he lived by when he was still a rector of the theological academy, so he again began to implement it in an unexpected context, and in the unexpected city of Rome. Obviously, he believed that someday the university would return to Lviv. We, while being seminary students, were simultaneously students of the same university.

[Seminary in Soviet times] was closed, it was closed. Josyf Slipyj was arrested in 1945. He served 18 years . . . in the labor camps and in exile. . . . In 1962 the Second Vatican Council began its work. . . . The Soviet Union . . . sent representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church to attend the Council. And they were already there in 1962, for the Council took place from 1962 to 1965 during the annual fall sessions . . . for four years in a row. In the fall of 1962, the 1st session took place. This session was attended by Ukrainian Greek Catholic bishops from the diaspora, but apparently all the bishops of the underground Greek Catholic Church in the Soviet Union, they were not permitted to attend the Council—they could not participate. And our bishops in the diaspora protested
that the Soviet Union was allowed to participate. . . . Representatives of Russian
Orthodox and Greek Catholics were forbidden, for that church was completely banned.

This was the same time when the crisis in Cuba happened, where Khrushchev sent
missiles . . . threatened the world with a war. The world came very close to a nuclear war . . . and . . . it was a very tense moment between Khrushchev and Kennedy, between the
Soviet Union and the States. . . . And Pope John XXIII . . . who called for this
revolutionary . . . Council also changed the attitude to communism and the Soviet Union
and called for dialogue. . . . John XXIII had an impact on, so to say, the removal of the
voltage during the Cuban crisis. Khrushchev wanted to thank and pay him back
somehow. John XXIII asked that Josyf Slipyj be released from prison. . . . This was the
beginning of ’63. It was in February . . . his release was in February . . . he moved to
Rome. Can you imagine? Completely disoriented; for 18 years he was completely cut off
from the world . . . came out with a very . . . deteriorated health, with frostbitten feet. He
even thought that he would not be alive for long, as he said later, and it was the month of
February. In autumn, I think it was October, he spoke at the Second Vatican Council. He
talked about the underground church in the catacombs. . . . He raised the question of
Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. Imagine that in St. Peter’s Basilica . . . there were
more than 2,000 Catholic bishops from different places coming every year to take part in
these four sessions of Vatican Council. And . . . on the day of feast of St. Clement the
Pope (old calendar, end of November) . . . he announced the creation of the Ukrainian
Catholic University, without anything else. At the time, there were only about 200
Ukrainians in Italy. . . . He signed the charter establishing the Ukrainian Catholic University, having then no land, no home, no students, no teachers . . . and he began to organize the funds to build a house. In 1969 . . . Pope Paul XI, successor of John XXIII, together with His Holiness Josyf Slipyj, consecrated the Cathedral of St. Sophia and the building of the Ukrainian Catholic University. And then, in the late ’60s, this center began operating as a research and publishing center, with a particular teaching. Since the early ’70s the seminary was established, which was called the College of St. Sophia, to which we, the seminary students, belonged. The College was a part of the Ukrainian Catholic University.... There we undertook some of our studies, even though most of our theological education took place in one of the pontifical universities in Rome. However, there were professors from different continents; Ukrainians came there, and quite a respectable publishing work was established.

Young people came to visit him, inspired by his example. Among those who visited him over the period of approximately ten years were several individuals with interest in the intellectual life. Among them was Andriy Chirovsky, who later founded the Andrey Sheptytsky Institute in Ottawa and was its summer director for a long time; Father Mykhaylo Dymyd who was my predecessor as rector of the Lviv Theological Academy. . . . That was such an environment. . . . We all, by the way, were seminarians in Lviv Archdiocese and we were being prepared to serve in Ukraine, although to influence Ukraine was almost impossible, to get there even as a tourist was difficult. . . . My personal journey [began in] ’83—when I graduated from the seminary basic course I
moved from Rome to doctoral studies at Harvard University with the idea to return to
Rome and work on the development of Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome. But then
the situation changed, bringing Gorbachev and perestroika in the late ’80s. I had the
opportunity, as an American student, to come on a study abroad to Ukraine. In 1988,
from January, I spent six months in Kyiv. And then I met with representatives of the
underground church. . . . It was becoming clear that Ukraine would change. . . . In ’89-
’90 I was in Ukraine. In 1991, the head of the church . . . Josyf Slipyj’s successor,
Cardinal Myroslav Ivan Lubachivsky, returned from exile from Rome to Lviv. It was
solemn moment. . . . I even had the privilege to be on the plane with him. And . . . in the
end of 1989 the church came out of the underground. . . . 1990 was a very eventful year. . .
In early 1991, Lubachivsky returned to the city, and the rebuilding of infrastructure
began. I had finished my doctorate and in ’92, in May, when I graduated from Harvard . . .
I got a telephone message that Blessed Myroslav Lubachivsky was asking me to work
on a project of the University. And it was a very courageous decision on his part. I was
31. I was not a priest, but . . . his vicar and general secretary, Father Ivan Dacko, was
educated by the Patriarch Josyf Slipyj in Rome. He was the chief of the diaspora
community mentored and educated by Josyf Slipyj.

They actually had this vision to restore Theological Academy, and to create the
University on the basis of the Academy. I became engaged in this work. And then we had
the green light, actually. . . . We had nothing and therefore had nothing to lose. So we had
an opportunity to ask a rather radical question: “In general, what is a university in the
21st century?” And from the beginning I asked questions and [approached] tasks because we had a unique opportunity not only for the Catholic Church, not only for the Ukrainian society, but even in a global context and . . . in the postmodern world in our post-Soviet [world] to ask: What might a university look like in the 21st century? And . . . we started rebuilding first the theological program and then other programs, as we looked for a more holistic approach. The university’s education is not concerned only with the mind and some professional competence, but it is more holistic. It looks at the whole person . . . not only intellectual development but also, say, mental and spiritual well-being first, and responsibility to society . . . the call to serve [paused in thought]. Sometimes this may even seem a radical [service], and that’s why—and this was quite natural for us many former students of . . . the Theological Academy from the ’20s-’30s, who were martyrs who . . . well, gave their lives for principles and are not afraid to confront totalitarianism of the Soviet Union, and became our supernatural protectors [Ukrainian: pokrovyteli].

We asked ourselves this question: “Is not this university/church community Ukrainian society’s answer key to the basic questions of the 21st century?” If the main issue in the 20th century was humans being confronted with totalitarianism, the students of the Theological Academy successfully and effectively answered this fundamental question of the 20th century—we had to prepare [graduates] not only for Greek Catholics, not only for Ukraine, but also for the international community to help with formulating an answer to the basic questions: “Who is man? What is a university education? What form should the university take? How . . . should an individual . . . the whole person, relate to others—
to social community, which consists of individual people—with dignity, divine dignity present in people created in the image and likeness of God?" How does this affect the question: “What is the university?” So . . . having received . . . a moral inspiration from the past, we had to start from the foundation. . . . It was a unique opportunity.

I think [universities] were primarily inspired by Christian . . . Christian ideology, that of vision science with the Christian Church. . . . Well . . . anthropology and history, Church history and the history of our local church. . . . Most people either do not know or tend not to fully imagine it, but . . . University . . . is . . . an institute that was established on the basis of monasticism. The first . . . universities in the Middle Ages . . . consisted, first, of the monks. And monastic community—“monastic,” as if to say monastery—this is a prototype for college. So this is . . . a community of people who not only . . . conduct intelligent research, but they live together, they pray together . . . and feel accountable to God and the people. So it was this dynamic . . . explicitly present in the universities in the first centuries of their existence. Then the processes of enlightenment and secularization in universities . . . were discovered by lay people and, in fact, only in the 20th century by women.... However . . . the more holistic model of universities was present during the Middle Ages. So, I had the opportunity to learn firsthand, as you know, in America and in Italy, but also in the Soviet Union . . . where I was an exchange student . . . at the University of Kyiv. I was in Poland for nine months . . . in Warsaw, University of Warsaw . . . in 1989. From 1992 to 1994 . . . I attended various universities in different countries and drew on . . . experience of 10 countries for the formation of the concept of
UCU. It became clear . . . that there was some crisis . . . the development of Western society . . . had, so to say, abundant fruits of freedom, on the value of the individual, but a radical individualism . . . resulted, so to say, in certain cases, in alienation [of a human person]. So 60-70 years after radical social changes that occurred in the Western world . . . people were searching for new cultural models and concepts. . . . UCU . . . is a response to contemporary issues, but these responses are also due to some historical or traditional precedents.
Appendix M

Research Protocol Approval and Informed Consent Form

TO: Beverly Shulkin, College of Education and Human Development

FROM: Sandra M. Sanford, RN, MSN, CRNP
Director, Office of Research Subject Protections

PROTOCOL NO.: 7323  Research Category: Doctoral Dissertation

PROPOSAL NO.: N/A

TITLE: Ukrainian University Leaders' Views on University-Based Moral and Civic Formation of Undergraduate Students in the Context of Post-Soviet Transition: Case Study of Ukrainian Catholic University

DATE: March 2, 2011

Co: Anastasia Samara
Svetlana Filatovna

On 3/2/2011, the George Mason University Human Subjects Review Board (GMU HSRB) reviewed and approved the above-cried protocol following expedited review procedures.

Please note the following:

1. A copy of the final approved consent document is attached. You must use the content approved in the consent form with the HSRB stamp of approval for your research.
2. Any modification to your research (including the protocol, consent, advertisements, instruments, funding, etc.) must be submitted to the Office of Research Subject Protections for review and approval prior to implementation.
3. Any adverse events or unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects including problems involving confidentiality of the data identifying the participants must be reported to Office of Research Subject Protections and reviewed by the HSRB.

The anniversary date of this study is 3/1/2012. You may not collect data beyond that date without GMU HSRB approval. A continuing review form must be completed and submitted to the Office of Research Subject Protections 30 days prior to the anniversary date or upon completion of the project. A copy of the continuing review form is attached. In addition, prior to that date, the Office of Research Subject Protections will send you a reminder regarding continuing review procedures.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 703-993-4015.
RESEARCH PROCEDURES

I am conducting this study as my doctoral dissertation research. This research is being conducted to explore views of UCU leaders on university-based moral and civic formation of undergraduate students and understand the ways, in which these views inform UCU’s organizational mission and practices.

I would like to ask you some questions about what is happening at UCU in terms of students’ moral and civic formation. We may need to talk a couple of times, as your answers and insights may require that I revise some of methods and approaches. The initial interview will take no longer than one hour, and I may want to follow up with shorter conversations for clarification or elaboration of your responses. And, if needed, I can help you with arranging access to a computer with Internet. Depending on technological feasibility, I may be using software program to record our conversations, so that I can go back and review it for my own learning and a more in-depth analysis of our conversations.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research.

BENEFITS

There are no immediate benefits to you as a participant.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The data in this study will be confidential. (1)Your name will not be included on my
notes with your interview answers; (2) a code will be placed on all collected data; (3) through the use of an identification key, I will be able to link your questionnaire to your identity; and (4) only I, the researcher will have access to the identification key. In addition, all audio recorded interview data will be stored in an electronic file, protected by a password, to which only I, the researcher will have access. While it is understood that no computer transmission can be perfectly secure, reasonable efforts will be made to protect the confidentiality of your transmission.

**PARTICIPATION**

Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. If you decide not to participate or if you withdraw from the study, there is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. There are no costs to you or any other party. At the end of your participation in the study, you will receive a letter acknowledging your role in developing the field study.

**CONTACT**

This research is being conducted by Svetlana Filiatreau at George Mason University. Ms. Filiatreau may be reached for questions or to report a research-related problem by telephone at x-xxx-xxx-xxxx, on Skype (ID: xxxxxxx), by e-mail, or by mail. Supervising dissertation research chairs, Dr. Beverly Shaklee and Dr. Anastasia Samaras, are faculty members at George Mason University. They can be reached by phone at x-xxx-xxx-xxxx and x-xxx-xxx-xxxx respectively, by e-mail, or by mail. If you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research, you may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Subject Protections at. This
research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT

The George Mason University Human Subjects Review Board has waived the requirement for a signature on this consent form. However, if you wish to sign the consent, please contact Svetlana Filiatreau by e-mail at xxxxxxx, or by mail. If you are able, it would be helpful if you would review this letter (I can e-mail it to you, if you have access to e-mail) and send it back to me. At the end, please type in your full name, which will be viewed as your electronic signature.
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